

THE MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1877.

ART. I.—THE HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE UNITED STATES.

THE events which with unusual frequency and startling magnitude are transpiring in our immediate social and political affairs, are well worthy of an earnest and careful study. To contemplate these events as for the last twenty-five years they have with overmastering power agitated, and to some extent revolutionized these interests, as isolated facts in our history, and to trace them no farther than to immediate and secondary causes, were to content ourselves with the unsatisfying labors of the partisan politician. In this view, these events would seem to be the transient results of misguided reason and passion, and that it needed only that they be rectified by the application of the necessary force, that the former condition of placidity might be restored, and the machinery of social and civil progress be once more set in regular motion; that the recent civil war for instance, was caused by southern slavery, and the unsolved question of states-rights, and that this question answered, and that institution removed out of the way, the current of our national prosperity returns to its channel, to turn again the wheels of our machinery, and enliven our fields with a fresh fertility.

But it requires no toilsome reflection, to see, that this view fails entirely to bring to light the true significance of these events. Has our late civil strife no more meaning for mankind and for civilization, than a rebellion in Hindoostan, produced by the spirit of caste, or a struggle as to what aspirant shall sit upon the throne of unhistorical China? Have these recent events, notwithstanding the jolts and jostlings which they gave our nation, dropped us again in the same old rut, with no enlarged outlook as to the destiny before us, and no new facilities, and fresh heart for future activity? Have civilization and Christianity no immediate or prospective profit to reckon against the terrific expenditure so lavishly made, and must humanity bewail these events as unhistorical and unpardonable waste? These are some of the questions which it is worth our while to consider.

But it may be further premised, that to consider these events as isolated, or only in their immediate causal relations, would be inadequate to their proper discussion and explanation, because only as we are able to discern the organic relations which bind them vitally to the past and to the future, and to comprehend them in the unity of the development of a grand historical purpose and idea, can we ever grasp their true significance. This purpose and idea, it is easy to see, finds its embodiment in our western civilization, of which our government and nationality are the expression. And only now as we consider these historical facts in the light of the great whole, in the bosom of which they live and move and have their being, can we understand them—can we apprehend their meaning and justification. In a brief discussion, therefore, of *The Historical Significance of the United States*, will opportunity be afforded us, to inquire into the meaning of the events which are transpiring around us, and the destiny, as related to civilization and Christianity, to which they point.

The idea of significance or meaning, as predicated of any fact, presupposes relations. An event without relations, if such

a thing is at all conceivable, has no meaning, but stands out as an anomaly, a monstrosity. In discussing, therefore, the historical significance of the United States, we must necessarily contemplate the fact of our nationality in its organic relations to the grand drama of history, as this, under Divine guidance has been enacted through the ages, upon the stage of the world's life. Thus may we learn its relation to the past, the forces which gave it birth, and the position in which it stands to civilization and Christianity, as these comprehend the whole plan and purpose of the world, its continued existence, and ultimate destiny. Moreover, if we would not fail in the purpose of the task now in hand, we must free ourselves from the exploded notion, that history is but the accumulation of incident and fact, as these have been thrown to the surface of human life, by the force of individual will and caprice, or by the ebullition of national passion and ambitious purpose, and hold it rather to be the power of a common life, flowing still onward as an undercurrent, bearing in its bosom those mighty plastic forces which are ever revealing themselves in the form of human action, and gathering together, from beginning to end, the whole order of vicissitude and event in a common unity of thought and wise design.

The review of the broad field of the history of civilization, must necessarily be exceedingly hurried and brief, and yet sufficiently patient and minute to note its steady onward movement, and mark its epochs, when gathering together the fruits of its expended labors, and the forces thereby developed, it mounts to a higher and richer plane of activity, in obedience to the hand which ever guides it onward and upward.

Upon the slightly elevated plain, contiguous to the base of Mt. Ararat in Armenia, Western Asia,—just at this time the arena in part of the renewed conflict between the Cross and the Crescent,—we find the early dwelling-place of post-diluvian man, and the cradle of civilization. As the years rolled on, and the human race rapidly multiplied, the families and tribes

moved forth in diverging lines to the occupancy of the earth appointed for their habitation. We may readily suppose, that the directions taken by these early families were determined by their immediate surroundings and necessities, totally unconscious of the ultimate destiny which lay before them and controlled them, and of the directing hand that marked out their pathways. Nevertheless each tribe wandered forth charged with a mission, and was led to that locality, where the circumstances of soil and climate, the conformations and reliefs of land and water, of mountain and plain, determined its development, and furnished the means and conditions for the enactment of its part in the great drama of history.

An exceedingly vague, and we may say untrustworthy tradition, of perhaps no more weight than a conjecture, exists, that at the head of a portion of his progeny, Noah himself wandered forth to the east, and from this migration grew up the Mongolian race. However this may be, certain it is that a migration went forth to the east of the Caspian Sea, which, occupying those immense steppes, at once frozen and unsusceptible of cultivation, and hedged in by those gigantic snow-clad mountains, peculiar to Central Asia, followed a wandering nomadic life. And to this day these Mongolian tribes, isolated from intercourse with their fellow-men, remain, overpowered by an unconquerable nature, a barbarous race. From these regions of perpetual cold, and unconquerable reliefs of mountain and elevated plain, a portion of these people, however, ultimately extended to the lower and more hospitable plains of the south-east, and established the Chinese Empire. But coming forth from their dreary northern homes, with energies crushed by overpowering continental surroundings, their powers stunted by the cruel rigor of their climate, and besotted by habits of indolent wandering, entering indeed into a region of more favorable climatic and geographical conditions, but still held down by the fatal incubus of a want of intercourse with other peoples, (for inaccessible mountains cut them off from the south and west), they

responded only partially to their more auspicious surroundings, and reached but an imperfect civilization. Centuries ago China, with a comparative facility reached her civilization, but isolated, and lacking the indispensable nutriment to be derived from communion with the world's life, it turned in upon itself, became stationary, and left her as she still remains, an unhistorical nation.

Did time allow we might indicate the rise and establishment of the higher but still imperfect civilization of the Deccan peninsula. Hindoostan enjoyed the advantage over a large part of the Chinese Empire, of a warm climate, a generous and easily tillable soil, and of nature brought well nigh to its richest fruitage and highest development. Yet with all these advantages, still held down by the hopeless fetters of impassable mountains, of vast and unconquerable plains, the human spirit cringed with slave-like subjection beneath the tyranny of nature, and yielding moreover, to an enervation incident to an almost tropical climate, after an early career of promise in the march of civilization, she long ago in her state of isolation, exhausted her resources and became a stagnant unhistorical people. For centuries have eastern and central Asia, to say nothing of the north where unrelenting winter reigns, remained fixed and stationary. And it has remained for the nineteenth century to witness indications of their awakening from their more than millennium sleep, and of a promise of their being drawn into the current of history.

But thus much in the way of preliminary remark. What concerns us in the discussion now in hand, is not so much the fortunes of those peoples, who like waters drawn aside from the current of the living stream, becoming entangled amid shoals and marshes, amid caves and mountain fastnesses, grow stagnant, or preserve a feeble vitality by restless chafings, or like eddies revolving upon themselves, fail in different measures in the purpose of their existence. It is needful the rather, that we turn to those nations, in the bosom of whose history, the

stream of civilization has moved forward, and who, having contributed to it their several elements and forces, have ministered to the gradual realization of the idea of humanity, as originally formed in the Divine Mind.

Besides these eastward movements, others from the same central point, radiated in all directions to take possession of a desolate world. Each to its appointed locality, where, by the moulding and educating power of the forms of relief of the surface of the country, the climate and soil, the presence of inland sea and river, the proximity of the ocean and the forms and contour of the coast-line, together with the consequent modes and habits of civil life, it might develop its special element of humanity. Thus to be prepared in the fullness of time, to furnish its respective complement, and act its part in the grand evolution of civilization.

It must be remarked, moreover, that the course of history moved not in a hap-hazard way, as destitute of control and guidance. But from the beginning to this day, in a regularly ordered course, in obedience to the organic laws of our human life, and in an unvarying geographical stream, which conducted it from the eastern home of its infancy, to our western stage of its manhood's growth. And most noteworthy, also, is the act that it remained not to maintain, nor returned to increase the historical fertility, in the lands over which it had passed, but flowing still onward in its westward course, it left them as morasses and pools, the prey of stagnation and decay. Especially is this the case with the two earlier stages of progress, the homes of the ancient Assyrian and Babylonian, and of the now characterless and imbecile Greek.

The migration of earliest historical significance, is the one which flowed southward upon the plain of Iran, extending along the banks of the Euphrates and Tigris into Mesopotamia, thence westward to the eastern shore of the Mediterranean, reaching Arabia and the land of Egypt. No portion of the earth's surface could be more favorable for a people, still help-

less in their inexperience and infancy. With a warm climate, and a soil fertilized by the annual overflow of its rivers, which responded most generously to the rudest and most primitive tillage. With plains of vast extent, inviting to an easy and abundant life. Still living under their original form of patriarchal government, these people increased and multiplied, until prompted by an enlarged social principle they formed more comprehensive governments, and rapidly grew into great and populous nations. Here arose the kingdoms of Assyria, Babylon and Egypt. These people not being left entirely without tax upon their industrial energies, what with the uncertainty of the overflow of their rivers; the threatened encroachment of the desert upon their fruitful fields, begetting the necessity of irrigation; an easy but *necessary* cultivation, and a provident forecast against the unproductive season, together with the disturbing urgency of their restless neighbors, they emerged from a state of infancy, to the strength of childhood and early youth. And it was then under an inspiration, born of a contemplative spirit, and quickened by the fiery element of a glowing sun, that they traced the record of their thoughts and actions, their aspirations and fears, which remain for later generations to read in their stupendous monuments and mighty ruins.

But with all their achievements they leave the record of a people fettered by a childlike servitude to the forces of nature. Soon forgetting the terrible lesson of the flood, and letting slip the memory of their fathers' God, they fell under the mastery of nature. They were appalled by her forbidding expanse and her frowning magnitude. The question of plenty or of scarcity and starvation, hung upon what was for them, the capricious floods of their life-giving rivers; while an almost tropical sun, now the giver of life and fruitfulness, and now the fierce consumer of his beneficent gifts, overpowered them with a sense of abject dependence and slavery. And it was just this child-life, not yet conscious of its powers as related to objective nature, this paralyzing sense of subjection, which

deified these powers of nature, and erected those mythical altars before which it paid such a dark and terrible devotion.

But we must not suppose that these peoples remained in a rude and barbarous state. On the contrary they advanced to a very respectable stage of civilization. True in the sciences they made small progress. But in the arts, and in their political relations they exhibited the opening powers of a nature which was destined to a growth and conquest, to the extent and consciousness of which they had not yet awakened. With a lively imagination warmed into activity by a glowing sky, they projected their conceptions of the beautiful, the enduring and the sacred, in their sculpture, their temples and their monuments, the ruins of which have excited the admiration of succeeding ages. But impelled by the dark passions of our fallen life, they early learned the arts of strife and warfare, and what little of their history has reached us, exhibits a continuous page of conquest and subjugation, of the rise and fall of dynasties, and a prodigal waste of resource even to exhaustion and decay.

With all these indications, however, of the wealth of resource which lay embosomed in their humanity, it is easy to note the marks of immaturity and child-life. Even though an occasional personage like a Cyrus, or a Darius should arise, embodying the fullest idea of their civilization, even to the forecasting of the following age, yet did they in turn give place to a weak Darius Codomanus, to be at last overwhelmed by the genius of a maturer civilization in the person of Alexander of Macedon. Were there no other indications of childhood, there were sufficient in their spirit and mode of warfare, at once bombastic and puerile. We need but call to mind the weak and petulant Xerxes, who in the midst of an unnumbered mob rather than an army, goes pompously forth to hurl to their destruction, his tumultuous legions, against the ramparts of a maturer life. Or to the Darius Codomanus, just referred to,

who thought by the gorgeousness of his equipage, the splendor of his retinue, and the magnitude of his undisciplined army, to terrify and disperse the comparatively small, but compact and trained army of Alexander.

In the meantime while this scene in the drama of history was passing through its enactment, and drawing onward to its close, in the bosom largely of the Semitic life, a neighboring people, of different lineage, were gradually elaborating the elements of a newer and richer civilization. Not in the midst of a country of continental isolation, of monotonous plains of vast extent, and gigantic reliefs and contrasts, but in small peninsular Greece. Did even time allow, it is not necessary for our present purpose, to inquire minutely into the origin and growth of this celebrated people. It is enough for us to know that they are part of the Indo-germanic migration, which diverging from the common cradle of the race, to the north and west, swept onward and occupied the entire continent of Europe. In Greece the conditions for a more vigorous growth and development of manhood were abundantly at hand. The reliefs and contrasts of the face of the country, unlike those of their eastern neighbors, were such as rather to encourage than forbid the effort to overcome them. The mountains were not of frowning and frozen elevation; the vallies and plains of an easy traversable extent; the climate, while salubrious and inspiring, was of a more bracing character, stirring to activity and quickening to energy; the soil, exacting a more patient industry, yet responding with sufficient liberality to these conditions. But above all, her maritime relations, served to awaken and invigorate the elements of a fuller manhood. With her shores indented with inlets, and her bays penetrating deep into the heart of the country, her people were stimulated to adventurous enterprise, resulting in communication and commercial relations with other nations and peoples.

Nothing is more favorable to stagnation than isolation. Being saved from this evil, and placed in easy intercourse with

all the nations bordering on the Mediterranean; invigorated by their own climatic and geographical conditions, and betimes strengthened by the infusion of a still more vigorous and self-reliant blood from their northern neighbors,—notably the Pelasgian influx; with their agricultural skill and knowledge of the useful arts, the ancient Greeks outstripped their older neighbors in the development of the latent powers of a common humanity. Besides, in consequence of her easy maritime relations to the highest forms of civilization then in existence, she became the early recipient of their noblest achievements in the arts and sciences and letters. All these with a precocious aptness she appropriated, and thereby enriched her naturally vigorous life. So that endowed with a scientific skill, and now armed with the newly discovered knowledge of the uses of iron, she was enabled to describe the line of demarcation between man and nature, and with uplifted head to affirm his dignity as *person*, over against nature as *thing*. Humanity here emerged from infantile subjection and slavery to nature, to the consciousness of mastery and headship.

This is clearly illustrated as well in her painting, her sculpture, her poetry, which at the same time embodies her religion, as in her philosophy. No longer are the now benign, now terrible gods, the symbols of the forces of nature. No longer does an overwhelming pantheism bewilder and suffocate with a universal sacerdotalism. But the person, the man, the hero, the human ideal mounts the altar of worship, and receives the joyous, but alas! the still misguided homage of the human spirit. The Greek awoke to the consciousness of his personal individuality, and caught glimpses of its wealth and spiritual nobility. All the way from the earliest epic of Homer, to the tragedy of Æschylus and Sophocles; from the lyric of Pindar to the comedy of Aristophanes, do we everywhere hear the human spirit protest its personal activity, its passions and aspirations, its longing hopes, and denounce its frowns upon all that is unmanly. So in her philosophy, from its infancy in

Thales, to the school of Socrates, standing upon the border line of a higher and more glorious culture, is individual man seeking his moral base, and striving to poise himself upon the fundamental centre of his being.

Greek civilization had made a grand advance upon the childhood of southwestern Asia, and awoke to the consciousness of youth and personal freedom. But like youth, its gaze was upon *self*, and its free activities were asserted against nature, as also against its own social surroundings. Society was yet but an aggregation of individuals, and the social principle feeble and undeveloped. The person was glorified even to deification, but lacked the cohesive organic principle, and consequently even in the celestial realm, the gods contended with each other in unseemly strife, and on earth, man struggled with man, tribe with tribe, and the nation strove to assert itself against the whole world.

The true idea of the state—the subordination of individual freedom to a common objective authority was wanting. This element was maturing and being brought to an utterance by their western neighbors in Italy. The Romans, enjoying the same auspicious natural conditions—schooled by a more rigorous experience, and animated by a spirit of daring adventure and conquest—enriched at the same time by the contributions of anterior civilizations, were enabled to realize, what the Greeks had so earnestly yearned for in their philosophy; and to accomplish, what they had failed to do in the abortive conquests of Alexander, the assertion, namely, of the cardinal principle of unity—the subordination of the particular to the general. It needs not to delay here to tell how this genius of authority went forth to the conquest of the world, and with what merciless severity it trod the principle of individuality under the iron heel of centralization. The elaboration of this principle was the mission of ancient Rome. And how well she accomplished it, whether in the sphere of her mythology, in Jupiter Capitolinus, or in her civil order, in a deified Emperor, her history most clearly indicates.

Hitherto the development of humanity was for the most part in the sphere of the natural, as a disciplinary preparation for the incoming of the supernatural order, as the bearer of its true significance and destiny. It was only at this juncture that the conditions of discipline were at hand for the insertion of the vitalizing principle of Christianity as the leavening power which was henceforth to fashion and control the onward development of human society, and, raising it to the plane of its own church life, conduct it to a finally consummated and glorified civilization.

Under the empire of the Cæsars, man while conscious of his personality, found himself nevertheless the slave of the state. For him his individuality was meaningless—except indeed in the gratification of his appetites and passions—only as conscious of his highest glory in being a Roman citizen. The doctrines of his ethical nature,—of his moral freedom and responsibility, which Socrates and Plato had so striven to teach the Greeks, were for the most part overwhelmed by the more congenial teachings of Epicurus and Zeno the Stoic, and he became at once the votary of pleasure, and the slave of an inexorable fate. The rulers were tyrants, the people were slaves. How the principle of free will, the self-determining power of the individual, by the regenerating power of Christianity came to an organic union with the old Roman civilization, we learn in the history of the Medieval period.

This principle, this new element of civilization, holding as it did from the beginning in the constitution of humanity, and now in the fitness of time brought forth for incorporation in the process of evolution, was during the ages being drawn out and elaborated by the main body of the Indo-germanic races, which had occupied the remaining portions of Europe. These people for a longer period maintained their tribal relations. Their mode of life was wandering and nomadic. They gained their livelihood at the expense of greater labor, and shielded themselves against a severer climate with more diligent care and

forethought. Called upon at the same time to defend themselves against far more numerous dangers, they early learned the lessons of self-dependence and hardihood, while frequent exercise in strife and warfare with their neighboring tribes, caused them to grow into a self-reliant and independent people. They were bold and adventurous, and stood forth in personal freedom, disdaining the restraints of civil law and order. From time to time we discover them making their sporadic incursions into the territory of their southern neighbors, withal to the benefit of these last, in quickening them to a livelier activity in the solution of the civic problems committed to their charge. But the time for the permanent infusion of their element of civilization into the life of southern Europe had not yet arrived. The hour, however, was struck when the aggressive spirit of Rome penetrated their wild homes, and aroused their spirit of adventurous conquest. In rapid succession these untamed hordes overflowed the fertile plains of the southern peninsulas, and overthrew the colossal, but now declining empire. A state of general chaos and anarchy appeared as the immediate result, and for a while it looked as though the edifice of civilization thus far erected, was hopelessly destroyed.

But the commingling elements were homogeneous and not antagonistic and mutually destructive. There were powerful affinities on either hand attracting each other. And they rushed to a coalescence with the noise of an explosion, and commingled in the midst of revolution and convulsion. But unlike chemical action in the sphere of physics—each element losing its specific character and unitedly resulting in a *tertium quid*—these seemingly conflicting factors were happily mediated by the mutual resolvent of Christianity, and the process of a Christian civilization was inaugurated. Thus were the elements of a riper civilization organically united, and a new life with befitting affinities and spiritual appetencies, was provided to go forth upon the mission of humanizing, civilizing and Christianizing the masses of Europe. The earlier centuries of this process

were necessarily marked by an emphasis laid upon the principle of authority. For the spirit of a wild and barbarous independence, must first of all be reduced to the restraints of law and order. And for a while the result seemed to be but the exchange of a political for a religious tyranny. But the element of personal liberty, and free self-determination, although hidden in the process of vital appropriation, never lost its vitality, but all the while was gradually maturing its energies for its permanent assertion in the sixteenth century. Since that time has the course of history moved steadily onward mainly upon her European arena, with various vicissitudes, and in the midst of manifold conflicts and struggles both civil and religious.

The predominant characteristic of European Civilization from the beginning is the prominence of the principle of authority. This was inevitable in view of man's sinful estate. The breaking up of his spiritual moorings in the fall, let go the human will to a selfish and centrifugal tendency, and now that he rises from thralldom to the tyrant forces of nature, to the consciousness of individual freedom, does he naturally antagonize his will to objective authority whether human or divine. It was necessary therefore, all along, that a firm restraint be laid upon this perverseness, until by the sanctifying power of the religion of Christ, he should be schooled to the lesson of a free and joyous submission to all right law and government. Only thus does he become a law unto himself, and is he fitted to enter upon the next higher plane of civilization.

The new life elaborated out of the elements just considered, by the regenerating energy of Christianity, passed northward through the pass between the Alps and the Pyrenees, and effecting a lodgement gradually spread over the remaining territory of the continent of Europe. It found the inhabitants in a state of barbarism, but with a hardy, self-reliant, vigorous manhood. The peculiar constitution of the incoming culture adapted it admirably to the wants of this barbaric life, in turn presenting and finding affinities which enabled it readily and rapidly to

apprehend and transfuse it with its own leaven. No sooner did it establish itself, than its humanizing and organizing powers were brought into play, and we find the old Tribal relations being compacted into more comprehensive forms, rising to the dignity of governments and nations. There had existed anterior to the formation of nations, certain races. These doubtlessly owed their origin to peculiarities of character, language and phases of humanity which marked the families and migrations from which they sprung. These same peculiarities determined their location and isolated them from their neighbors, and in this state of separation they hardened into those features which afterwards distinguished them as distinct races, such as Goths, Vandals, Celts, Picts, &c.

The nations thus founded, were in common partakers of the new civilization which was now possessing the continent. But they were at the same time differentiated by the race peculiarities just adverted to. These differences were constitutional in the several peoples, and hence may properly be denominated phases of humanity. So that while the common mission for each was to elaborate a fuller and higher development of their equal heritage, they could do so only, subjected to the differences of constitution which marked them. It was to be expected therefore, that as their several nationalities were matured in feature and content, contrasts would be revealed, differences of mind, temperament, of disposition and aptitude would characterize them severally. No one measuring the idea of the civilization of the age, yet each one presenting one or more of its features in maturity and perfection. As a whole they exhibited the several complementary sides of a contained unity.

These race peculiarities were further controlling in the determination of limited boundaries and areas. But in addition to this. The condition of the original inhabitants as characterized by a wild personal independence and self-will, called, as already remarked, for the discipline of social law and order. This could be effectually done only within comparatively small territorial

limits. The effort put forth by the old Roman Culture, to comprehend within its grasp, remote nations and different races, resulted in a cold mechanical aggregation, rather a crushing subjection of the individual to the general. It lacked the humanizing spiritual elements of Christianity, to reach the heart and fashion the life in its true sense, and hence it failed of any advance upon a higher plane than its own. But now having been enriched and transformed by the infusion of this ethical and religious spirit, this Roman civilization had developed susceptibilities and affinities which prepared it for an organic apprehension of, and union with the element dominant in the European races. This, as just said, could be efficiently done only within comparatively narrow national limits. The principle of authority, lodged in the head of the government, now softened by the newly acquired consciousness of a parental sympathy, required the facilities of intimate relations and closeness of contact, that it might with a gentler hand and a more affectionate constraint, bend and mould the stubborn spirit of self-will, until in the course of the ages it might awaken the responsive sentiment of filial obedience. Authority exercised at a remote distance, through the intervention of hireling satraps, is severe, forbidding and tyrannical, breeding a spirit either of insubordination or slavery. Contrariwise, a humane and parental administration, made to reach and mould all its subjects, begets that sense of common relationship and family unity, which expresses itself at last in the consciousness and form of a general nationality.

Such was the order of growth and development in European civilization. It was necessary that the continent be divided among the several nations. That the areas be comparatively small, even to the dividing of the more numerous races into two or more nations. And as each one had a task, differing in its specialty, yet equally essential to the whole, it was alike necessary that their territorial lines be deeply drawn, and a comparative isolation preserved; that each one in its place might

perform the work committed to its charge. The result of all this is the several nationalities of Europe as they now exist. Neither one by itself measuring the idea of European civilization, yet as the several complementary factors, in the aggregate they comprehend and illustrate it in its fulness.

But European civilization does not, nor can it reach the ideal of humanity. Like all the preceding stages of history, each one maturing the elements and preparing for a transference upon a higher plane, so that of modern Europe is but a preparation for a farther and still higher advance. What with all her proud achievements, the magnificence of her conquests in arts, and arms, and learning, and the wealth of her mature manhood, she has failed to actualize the catholicity and organic unity of humanity. And it requires no very acute observation, to discern that her several nations are awaking to a growing and intenser sense of this fact. There is a growing feeling, that within their present limits, their missions are well nigh accomplished; and if they would not stagnate, they must find larger room, and new material upon which to exercise their appropriating energies. This is the meaning of the restlessness which characterizes these nations in these later times. There is an oppressive sense of diversity among them, and an impulse after unity. And with no power in their present historical and geographical conditions, to rise above each one's own particular phase of civilization, the common effort is to encroach upon their neighbors and to assert themselves at the expense of their co-ordinate fellows. We may note in this regard, the successful effort recently made toward the unification of the Germanic and Italian peoples, and the nervous and warlike interest with which each and all regard the question of the "balance of power." The conflicts and struggles through which these nations have passed in former ages, had the effect to develop, to energize and compact their several nationalities, but having reached their maturity, they are chafing under their limitations in exhausting and profitless conflicts.

European civilization has reached the historical limit described for it by the finger of God, and if it had eyes to see, it might read, "hitherto shalt thou come, but no further." If the precedents of history—of the infancy of civilization in southwestern Asia, its youth in Greece, and its early manhood in the Roman Empire, are not about to be set aside, then the best that remains for it in the future, if it would escape retrogression through enervating strife, is patiently and in faith to hold the post assigned it, and with parental self-abnegation continue to contribute its matured material to the onward movement which an ordering Providence is still conducting forward in its unvarying westward course.

Meanwhile, while these processes were moving onward on the continent of Europe, the Wisdom which planned it all, and ordered its growth, was preparing a new arena, with space and resource for a higher and fuller development. It is hardly necessary to say that this arena was North America, and that the nation charged with the new mission, was the United States.

A feature of marked peculiarity, in sharp contrast with all areas upon which the preceding civilizations were elaborated, characterizes the territory of the United States. They all contained an element of civilization of their own growth. Their inhabitants were invested with a historical significance. They were endowed with a phase of humanity, peculiarly their own, which awaited the incoming of the older forms from the east, that being apprehended by them it might be borne onward to higher and richer developments. Not so the United States. Here were no elements of indigenous growth. The aborigines, a scattered and savage people—a race of outcasts from the fold of humanity, without significance in the problem, were present as an incumbrance, and needed only to be thrust out of the way. Unless indeed they were to serve the purpose of outside barriers, to prevent a too rapid diffusion of the incoming populations, and by their opposition, to compact the new settlements

and hasten a vigorous organization of states. So far as human life in its proper historical sense is concerned, this country was a desolation, preserved as such, doubtless for its appointed purpose. The materials for the human edifice about to be erected within its confines, were to be brought from the old nations beyond the sea.

Another feature worthy of remark, is the remoteness of its situation, and the efficiency of the barrier which separates it from the nations which were to furnish the materials for the superstructure about to be erected. This isolation was necessary. The European nations having matured and ripened the several elements of their culture, they were called upon in the order of Providence, to furnish the best fruits of their life, for the historical elaboration of a higher type. The man of each nationality was indeed a mature man, but expressing predominantly some one phase of a common civilization, in contrast with his fellow-nationalities. The mission now of the American life was to so combine these different phases, and blend their peculiarities, as out of these several, as species to produce the generic man—the ideal man of this European civilization. This new process, it is easy to see, was entirely different from the preparatory one now maturing its results, and required entirely different conditions and internal administration. An easy transference of the different phases to a near by arena, must have involved an in-weaving of their contrasts in the organization of colonies and states. And these being readily replenished from their respective homes, would have grown into new and different nations, in the precise image of the old. The result would have been to repeat the European process over again. And this was precisely the form which the several nationalities were assuming in our first colonial settlements. We need only call to mind, the attempts which were made to transplant intact, and in organized form, the British, the Dutch, the German, the Spanish and the French national lives, and how it was at the first, that these old forms of culture began to assert

their hereditary peculiarities and exclusiveness, each one trying to crowd the other aside and supplant it.

But notwithstanding this tendency to national coalescence, such was the individualistic character of the migrations in large measure, and such a weakening of the old national ties incident upon a breaking up of the home feeling; such a feeling of alienation after a long and dangerous journey, whose steps were never to be retraced, deepened by the necessary commingling of different peoples in a strange land—all these together with the deep and unconscious cravings for unity, which already were agitating the nations of the father-land, that it required but the ripening of the tendencies hereby generated, and their emergence into intelligent consciousness, that the possibility of a new Europe upon the American continent passed forever away. Great Britain, pre-eminently of all the foreign states, feeling the straitness of her borders, and the largeness of her adventurous and commercial bent, incident to her acquired expertness in the arts and sciences, in manufacture and navigation, sought to transplant her nationality intact. But while successful in dispossessing the Hollander, in driving the Spaniard to the southern continent, in thrusting the German into the wild interior, and in warring with the Frenchman for the supremacy, she was but fostering the spirit, but maturing the civilization, which was presently to utter itself in the pregnant words, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are born free and equal, and are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights."

The task to be performed in this western world—the mission with which the United States is charged, as already said, is to take the elements of civilization, matured and brought to a sharp conscious definition, by the nations of Europe, and by a new and higher process of history to evolve from them a unity. This could never be done in Europe. Aside from the insuperable barrier of a Divinely ordained historical mission, the tenacity with which national and home peculiarities are adhered to,

and the whole order of climatic conditions, of geographical reliefs and contrasts, and territorial limitations, the one fact of the difference of languages, is a fatal hinderance. Should some mighty social revolution convulse her nations and reduce her people to a mechanical mass, we would witness the re-enactment of the scenes of Babel, when by the confusion of tongues the children of Noah were broken up into separate tribes. The experience of the emigrant to the European states, is to lose his nationality, and to be absorbed by a strange life. And so must it ever be, while the special social order there existing continues. But with the United States it is entirely different. All the conditions of a cosmopolitan life are at hand.

As to our territorial organization, it is to be remarked, that like Europe, we are divided into several states, but of smaller areas. This is still necessary. The more nearly a government is in contact with its people, the more efficient is it for all disciplinary purposes, and the more effectually can it exert its plastic parental power in the moulding and formation of life and character. While on the other hand, the more readily do the people imbibe its spirit and awake to the consciousness of a common life. The respective state governments are, in all that pertains to social relations and municipal administration, sovereign. In this respect like the European States, with the limitation, however, of an overshadowing General Government. It must not be supposed, however, that they are the *fac-simile* of each other, embodying the same elements in the same proportions. On the contrary, there are marked differences among them, easily discernible. These are caused by their remoteness from or proximity to the sea-board; the predominant European element incorporated in the life and character of the social and educational institutions which have been cherished; and especially by the climate and soil and the face of the country. As is to be noticed in all past history, a vigorous climate, with its more laborious exactions, produces a more self-reliant and ingenious order of culture. And especially where

these conditions are enriched with immediate maritime relations, with their adventurous and commercial bent, does there arise that aggressive and moulding spirit which characterizes the northern peoples. In milder latitudes, with a more fertile soil, exacting less labor in its cultivation, lying inland and without the stimulus of navigable streams and lakes, a more uniform, mild and less demonstrative form of society grows up. While as we proceed to the south, with its enervating heat, and its more productive soil with its accompanying deficiency of skill and industry in husbandry, do we find an aversion to muscular activity, while a heated blood fires the life with inflamed appetites and passions.

Any one at all observant of the peculiarities which mark the different sections of our country, cannot fail to notice the restless activity, the inventive genius and the adventurous enterprise of New England; the patient industry, and conservative tempered activity of the Middle States; as also the fiery passion, the want of physical energy, and the aversion to change and adventure in the remote south. These peculiarities, however, are not abnormalities. They are genuine elements of our civilization. And as in the past, the several elements have been matured and developed as specialities in separate localities, so in this country, in their several latitudes these same complementary factors are growing to a riper maturity.

Thus it is that in a very important and indeed necessary sense, (for each advanced stadium of history gathers up and carries forward all the preceding processes) we are repeating the processes of European civilization in our state organizations. But with these radical differences. The states of Europe are not only sovereign in themselves, but are separated by race lines and are in this regard heterogeneous, by sharply defined territorial boundaries, and especially by the still more effectual wall of separation, the difference of language. At the same time also, they are without the mediation and unifying presence of a general government. The absence of all these sundering

differences, and the presence of a Federal Government are precisely the peculiarities which mark our civilization, and raise it to a higher plane. Theirs is an aggregation, ours is an organism.

As we have seen, American civilization begins where the European ends. This last matured the elements, and generally by schooling the individual will to a free accord and normal subordination to right objective rule, the man was prepared for a state of autonomy, while the former, with no new element to prepare, receives upon an unoccupied area, the material ready shaped and fashioned for the erection of the new edifice of self-government. Whatever may have been the proximate causes which induced the migrations, whether under government auspices; under the leadership of adventures; or communities and families and individuals driven by persecution, or moved by a desire to improve their condition or mend their fortunes, the ultimate impulse unquestionably was a sense of having transcended their state of pupilage and its restraints, and of a preparation for the formation of new relations within a larger sphere, for social and religious and political freedom.

It required time for these people to take root and become established in their new country. Communities were to be formed, towns built, governments founded, and the general machinery of civilized life was to be put in motion. And it was necessary that meanwhile they should enjoy the fostering care and protection of their old home governments. But remote now from the seat of governmental power, with boundless scope for personal activity, and thrown largely upon their own resources and judgment, they gradually grew to a consciousness of the significance of their mission, and a clearer perception of the destiny which beckoned them onward.

It would certainly, however, be too much to affirm, that the founders of our government had a clear apprehension of the meaning of the work they were performing, and intelligently shaped its constitution with reference to the historical issues

which are to be compassed by it. They acted under the inspiration of a Divinely ordered history, unconscious of their inspiration, and controlled by current events, and pressing relations and necessities. They were the willing instruments in the hand of the God of civilization and humanity, and they planned with a depth of wisdom, and wrought with a consummation of skill, they little dreamed of. The formation of the early confederacy was a prudential expedient, necessitated by the task of achieving the freedom and independence of the colonies, upon which they had resolved. Yet, so was this union consolidated and cemented and unified by that long and terrible seven years' war, that its previously undiscovered elements of permanency hardened into a historical institute. And now in contrast with all that preceded it in the evolution of history, we have a large number of States, with sovereign control over their own internal interests, for the education and further development of the several phases of human life as comprehended within their respective borders, all bound together by a General Government, and animated by a common nationality.

This nationality, it will be borne in mind, is the living complex of the different European nationalities, their mature elements of manhood fused into one, becoming thereby cosmopolitan. The facility with which these component nationalities coalesce and flow into one is truly wonderful. Nothing like it was ever seen before, nor can it be accomplished this day in any other portion of the civilized world. In Europe these elements seem to be heterogeneous, repelling each other, or uniting by the absorption of the incoming life. But landed upon the shores of the United States, it is received into a kindred bosom, where losing its separatistic features, it flows into a cosmopolitan life. Thus is it that our American civilization in its ultimate, perfect actualization, will be the ripe fruit of all the past processes of history.

The old Monarchical form of government, is the embodiment of the principle of a *jure divino* authority, as transmitted in

the line of royalty, and presupposes the immaturity and pupilage of the citizen. As such it looks forward to his maturity and manhood, and is the prophecy of his capability of self-government. The Republican form assumes the mature manhood of the citizen, the conscious equipoise and organic reconciliation of subjective will and objective law, and is the expression of neither the one principle nor the other, separately taken, but of their union—as such, of the autonomy of man. It is consequently based upon the suffrage of the citizen. Its rule of law, is not *principle* as abstract and apprehended by the intuitive reason, as in the case of the monarchy, but this same principle as concretely and consciously at hand in the embodied humanity of the citizenship. Its powers are consequently conditioned by the will of the citizen, which will expresses itself first in the organization of the State, and through the State becomes concrete in the form of the General Government, but of limited powers, in consequence of the retained sovereignty of the State. It, the General Government, is therefore, the head of the body politic, the embodiment of the general power and law, which is to stand for the defence and consolidation of the grand unity, and for the regulation and stimulation of inter-state relations and intercourse.

All this now is made possible by a common language. Take this away, separate each State from all the others by the almost insuperable barrier of a different language, and we rapidly revert to the European stadium. Free inter-state communion would be an impossibility, and each in its isolation developing its own particular phase of life would drift farther and farther into separation. But with this effectual means of intercourse, the existing fraternity, the more than easy means of intercourse afforded by our railroad system, and the easy terms of citizenship to the citizen coming from a sister State—the different phases of life and tendencies of growth, whether the fruit of foreign nationality or caused by climatic or maritime or inland conditions, are softened and moulded into a common nationality.

The first century of our national existence, just closed, was required for the work of organization, the exploration of the vast territory, the diffusion of the populations, the discovery and development of our resources, the establishment of easy and rapid means of intercourse and communication, and the general adjustment of affairs for the work committed to our hands. Time would entirely fail me in attempting even the most general sketch of the gigantic magnitude of the work, and the almost miraculous facility and completeness with which it has been accomplished. I can only point to the present estate of the country with its just organized energies, and the absolutely incalculable amount of its undeveloped resources, as the illustration. While the nations of Europe are overburdened with population, and are jostling each other even to the extremity of war, we, with a population but little larger than France alone, have a territory but little smaller than their whole continent. And while they are discovering indication of exhaustion in their material resources, ours are found to be in practically inexhaustible supply. These facts indicate the magnitude of the work before us. For all observation and history demonstrate that the God of Providence has creatively treasured up the means, where the work is to be done, and all material resource has He ordained as subsidiary to His high and holy purpose in the destiny of humanity.

In this preparatory century, besides the tasks just adverted to, it has fallen to the lot of our civilization to correct certain incongruities, and to thrust divers obstacles out of the way. Chief among these were the causes which gave rise to our late civil war. From the beginning there was a question as to the precise limits of State sovereignty, and the extent of the reserved rights. Beside this, there had fallen to us as an inheritance from an older civilization, the institution of human slavery. By rapid degrees this last gravitated naturally to the warmer and less energetic South. Here, it flourished, and redounded to large pecuniary profit, but unfortunately at the

same time co-operating with an enervating climate—enervating to the body, but stimulating to the passions, it served if not to retrograde, at least to retard progress in our growing culture. This, of course, was felt consciously in the whole body politic, and gave rise to effort and counter effort in the direction of its restriction and ultimate extinction. This conflict served to direct attention to the still unsettled questions touching State sovereignty, and to call forth the affirmation, with new emphasis and clearer definition, of the extreme and fatal doctrine, that the reserved rights reached even to the sunderance of relations with the General Government. Meanwhile, whatever may have been the prevailing view in this regard, of the founders of our government, who were in large measure unconscious of the ultimate significance of the civil polity they were about inaugurating, the process of growth, the compacting of the elements, and the awakening of the national consciousness, had led to the perception of the utter fallacy and revolutionary tendency of that doctrine. The consequent resistance with which the attempt to actualize this doctrine was met, may at first perhaps have been prompted by no deeper feeling, than the necessity of the immediate preservation of the Union. But it is now easy to see, that the whole interest of American civilization, as contrasted with European, hung upon the issue. Hence the active, and to our government offensive sympathy, which the secession movement awakened in Europe. Its successful assertion would have been to turn back the stream of history as it had flown down through the ages.

Had the purpose of the Southern Confederacy succeeded, and the South thereby excluded the vitalizing energy and robust vigor of the colder North, as a counterpoise to the effects of her warm climate, and her predominantly agricultural and secluded life, what she must have become in the scale of civilization may be seen in Europe in the same isothermal belt. And this too, not to mention the effects which must have inevitably resulted from the inauguration of a process of disin-

tegration. How this tendency must have been intensified by an expansion of the institution of African slavery with its gradually deteriorating effects upon the social system, it is sad to contemplate.

But all this was an absolute impossibility. Had the separation taken place, it could not have endured. It would have been to fly into the face of physical geography. Unlike Europe our dividing lines of highland and mountain range, all run north and south. Our northern boundary is the only east and west line of separation on the continent. But independently of this, what with the hindering power of the sameness of nationality; the inseparable bond of a common language, and the whole overwhelming force of the world's civilization as ordered and guided by the hand of Almighty God against it, its failure was sealed by destiny.

The struggle, however, was necessary, and abundantly fruitful of beneficial results. Its causes served to mar the unity of our national life, and to prevent that free interflow of the various elements, essential to the equalizing of its growth and progress, and the modifying and utilizing of its different tendencies. The unification, therefore, of our nationality, and its consequent preparation for the solemn task appointed to it by an overruling Providence, required their removal out of the way. And now that the country is recovering from the exhaustion caused by the dreadful struggle, and her powers and institutions are being adjusted to the new order, relieved at last of her former hinderances, and with a spirit invigorated, and at the same time chastened by the trials through which she has passed, she is prepared to bend her energies more immediately to the accomplishment of her mission.

From this general review of the history of civilization, it would seem that the Historical Significance of the United States consists in this:—Without any original material of her own, she receives the matured elements, as these have been elaborated and prepared in different combinations and proportions

by the several nations of Europe, and by a process combining in principle all their individual processes, she in the alembic of a vital chemistry is to fuse them into a homogeneous unity, thus to evolve a civilization in which shall be united all their excellencies, and all their deficiencies be compensated. And by so doing, to produce their ideal. For the accomplishment of this work, we are provided with a country, exceptionally shaped in outward contour and physical geography, and specially located with reference to varieties of climate and facility of intercourse with the whole world, which bears the marks of that wise designing Mind which planned it all, and under whose guidance it is now going forward to a perfect consummation. Our work is but just begun, our energies are just acquiring a skillful cunning, and with abounding supply of material resource at hand, we enter upon this second century of our national existence with joyous hope, and an inviting outlook in the future.

But whatever our resources for independent action, the mutual interdependence of the United States and the States of Europe still exists, and for all that can now be seen, will continue to exist. They can never rise above their separatistic condition of one-sidedness, but must look across the Atlantic for the realization of their ideal. We in turn must continue to look to them for the prepared vital material upon which to exercise our transforming skill. To us, as to their destination for the accomplishment of their final purpose, must they bear their treasures of art and science and learning, together with their accumulation of wealth. For we are their natural heirs, and only in the life of the child, do the life and labors of the parent come to their perfect fruitage. Let no one imagine that we are making high pretensions to heirship. We ask no more than what Europe has given us from the beginning, what she is now giving, and what she always will give—what she always *must* give us. She is sealed to this order by the laws of history—by the entail of an organic civilization, which neither she nor we can break. Some of her nations have turned their eyes to the east. Espe-

cially has Great Britain sought to stamp some of the Asiatic people with the impress of her civilization. But with what feeble results we need not pause to consider. She may draw material gain from her intercourse with them, and transport it to her shores, she may invest in the Turk with the sure prospect of a provoking permanence, but to apprehend their life, to say nothing of the results were it possible, is barred by the laws of civilization itself. The English and the Hindoostanee may live side by side, but like oil and water, you may by jostling mix them, but you can never unite them. The vital conditions of civilization are wanting. If apprehended at all, in this regard, it must be by a life reaching them from the east. The laws of history interdict a march from the west. Hence what England assayed to do, and would have failed but for the strength of gunpowder, in case of China and Japan, the United States effected by mild and easy means. The vital power of civilization moving *towards* the west, can do what the cannon cannot aimed *from* the west.

To attempt a forecast of the future in the history of our civilization, while it might be interesting in the way of speculation, gives us at this time but small promise of profit. And yet we naturally bend inquiringly towards the future. Two questions at this time rise like clouds upon our horizon and inspire a spirit of inquiry. The one, the incorporation of the African element into our citizenship, the other the irruption of the Mongolian race upon our western shores. Regarding them in the light of the laws revealed in the history of civilization, the outlook is by no means promising. In point of time the African is more than a thousand years behind the European. His path in the march of culture, would lead him to the east, where the affinities stretch out westward towards him, and not to the west which has transcended his stadium, and presses onward towards the setting sun. His elevation may be hastened by education, but the development of the intellect is only one factor in civilization. There are many deeply learned Hindoos, but they are Hindoos still.

As to the Mongolian, all that can be said in his behalf is, that he comes from the right direction. He feels the historical affinities reaching him from the east, and he is drawn forth in response. But he finds no congenial bosom. And in turn our life finds no preparation in him. Our civilization by its very constitution requires matured material, the man fitted for autonomy, and other it has no power to appropriate. Our government might, as in case of the African, admit him to citizenship, but like oil cast upon water, he can reach no real union.

But we know not the future. American civilization looks like the closing scene of a drama.—The ending of a vital process. There seems, to our vision, to be no preparation going forward to the westward for our reception. History appears about to produce its ripened fruit, and contains not, as we can read it, any prophecy for the future. None but He whose wisdom and power are illustrated in the whole course of history and civilization, and whose gracious designs are drawing on to their final glorification in the kingdom of His Son, Jesus Christ, can tell, what new departure may be nigh at hand, or whether the drama of human life is really in its last act in the present order of earthly existence.

S. N. C.

ART. II.—DOMINION AND SUBORDINATION THE NORMAL
RELATIONS OF SOCIETY.

BY ALEXANDER HARRIS.

PHILOSOPHERS from the earliest ages have discussed the condition of man with reference to his state in life and society. The questions that have arisen, have been whether it is fixed, as by solemn decree, that to some the sceptre of superiority is given, upon others the necessity is imposed, of being life-long hewers of wood and drawers of water. It has been perceived by all who have been able to penetrate into the mysteries and realities of life, that the great bulk of mankind have been necessitated to occupy those conditions in the world in which they are compelled to labor for the support of themselves and their countrymen, whose capacities have fitted them to assume the directory over themselves and the unreflecting laboring classes. If an adjustment to their varied stations has been arranged by the Omniscient Creator for humanity, then are some (as Aristotle has asserted) born subordinates or slaves, and ever remain such; whilst others come into life clothed with the capacity of mastership as their natural attribute.

This view of existence, which we are now ready to accept as that indelibly stamped upon the face of human creation, seems at first glance to invoke sentiments of commiseration for the classes consigned to be the drudges of life. But this is clearly the result of a one-sided view of the whole of humanity; for it is evident that gradations in society must exist, have ever existed in all ages and nations, and will continue to do so to the end of time. And in the doom inflicted upon our

earthly progenitor, that IN THE SWEAT OF HIS BROW, HE SHOULD EAT HIS BREAD, UNTIL HE RETURNED TO THE DUST, we recognize simply the mandate imposed upon man to labor for his support, and for the promotion of his earthly comfort. And all the efforts to free himself from this condition, have resulted in disappointment and in the overthrow of all natural order in society. For do not all labor from the highest to the lowest; but the toil thus exerted is of different kinds and species, and all adapted to the varied capacities of those performing the same; or it at least should be so.

The ancient and modern world until recently, fully recognized the decrees of nature implanted upon the face of universal being; and it is only in modern times that man has openly revolted from the laws of his creation; and thrown states, society, and government, into chaos and seemingly irreparable disorder. The early history of man, as detailed in biblical and other ancient records, unfolds the natural development of society and the dominion and subordination that in like manner arose for the preservation of order and repose. We find that nature in all its relations eschews equality, and provides for perpetuation by making one thing constantly subordinate itself to another; and does so in order that law and harmony may obtain in the aggregated whole of life and existence. Do not God and Nature show this inequality in all men and women, there being no two individuals identically alike, in either mental or physical proportions? And in the first steps which nature has selected in the formation of society, are not dominion and subordination visibly called into existence and made to perform their appropriate functions in all the ways of nature's appointment? In the family state, the husband and father is made to perform the task of mastership; obedience being required upon the part of the wife and children. Nature has accorded to the father the direction in the family sphere, having clothed him with superior strength and capacity (save in unequal and therefore unnatural alliances) to perform the tasks allotted to Him

as the head of the household. And in all the Oriental systems of civilization the family is made the foundation of society; and governmental authority is moulded in accordance with similar views. And these systems are all of them, almost as old as society itself, and have suffered but slight variations since the birth of recorded history.

It is only in European civilization, that contrary ideas have been germinated, but in whose germination radical defects have been allowed to inter-penetrate themselves, and whose influence has permeated, as with desolating virus, the whole of that civilization, and threatens at length to make it a mockery in the preservation of purity, truth, and virtue, the cardinal safe-guards that must be defended and pressed against all assailants.

A conception of later ages that has perhaps done more than all others to disturb the repose of society, is that which asserts the universal equality of all men, a dogma having no support either in truth or in any of the older systems of social life; and which simply is a product of modern infidel philosophy, and one that runs counter to educated thought and the intelligent observation of all classes of men. But the asserted equality being too bald an absurdity as to claim candid support, has been so modified as to declare simply EQUALITY BEFORE THE LAW, likewise in itself a manifest untruth. Another destructive error that has taken possession of the modern mind, and which is also a product of infidel philosophy, is that which has demanded and caused the disunion of religion and government, both of which must form supplementary and integumental parts of every complete governmental structure. It is only in our own country, however, that this last error has been able to fasten itself upon the constitutions and legislatures of the country. In all the other states and governments of the world, this evil innovation has been kept at bay; its blighting effects, however, are slowly but surely making their headway in the boasted land of free America, and ushering in a day of crime that must end in the detection and exorcism of the foul fiend of human repose.

In the free school system of the different States of America, the pestiferous fruits of the expurgation of religious instruction from government spheres are showing themselves throughout the whole country; and as yet the real evil with the masses of the people is almost unsurmised. That religion must ever form the basis of education, the world's theologians, legislators and philosophers have ever believed. Archibald Alison, a celebrated European author, says: "Education, if not based on religious tuition, is worse than useless, and every day's experience is adding confirmation to the eternal truth."* M. Cousin, another European celebrity, uses the following language: "Religion is, in my eyes, the best, perhaps the only basis of instruction. I know a little of Europe, and I have never witnessed any good popular schools, where Christianity was wanting. The more I reflect upon the subject, the more I am convinced, with the directors of the ECOLES NORMALES, and the ministerial counsellors, that we must go hand in hand with the clergy, in order to instruct the people and make religious education a special and large part of instruction in the primary schools. I am not ignorant that these suggestions will sound ill in the ears of some, and that in Paris I shall be looked upon as excessively devout; but it is from Berlin nevertheless, and not Rome, that I write. He who speaks to you is a philosopher, one looked upon with an evil eye and even persecuted by the priesthood, but who knows human nature and history too well not to regard religion as an indestructible power, and Christianity when rightly inculcated, as an essential instrument for civilizing mankind."†

The editor of the *Philadelphia Daily Times*, on the 13th of June, 1877, uttered the following gloomy sentiments in speaking of the Pennsylvania free school system: "Nine-tenths of the young criminals sent to the penitentiary have enjoyed its advantages, but three-fourths of them have never learned to do

* Alison on Population, vol. 2, p. 292.

† Rapport sur l'Instruction de l'Allemagne, p. 272.

an honest stroke of work. Surely there must be something wrong about a system which thus recruits the great army of idlers and criminals, and it is not wonderful that many thoughtful men believe, though they scarcely dare to speak it aloud, that our public schools are an evil rather than a good. . . .

. . . They (our children) must have their poor little brains crammed full of all kinds of impossible knowledge of names and dates, and numberless and unintelligible rules, till there is absolutely no room left to hold any of the simple truths of honor, duty, and morality, which former generations deemed more important than all the learning of the books."

Our appalling and still increasing social corruption, as the above writer distinctly perceives, is largely to be traced to the free school system, which affords no religious or moral instruction to the youth of our country. The want of religious instruction in our public schools is an evil that many individuals are free to recognize; and hence the unceasing efforts that are continually being made to have the Bible read in the public schools, in order thereby, as conceived, to produce a higher tone of morality in the minds of the young people than prevails at the present day. The real evil, however, is overlooked by all except a few; which exists from the fact that our government has been established upon a purely secular basis, as if religious conceptions formed no part of man's mental conformation whatsoever.

Rational philosophy and religious faith have hitherto formed constant counterparts in the world's life, and must ever continue to do so, if man is to be governed, as the Creative Mind designed that he should be. But where reason alone has attempted this task, as was essayed during the French revolution, government has always failed, and the same must ever repeat itself. Europe has been prolific in the invention of varied schools of philosophy. She is, however, unable to lay claim to maternity for any of the great world-religions: Christianity, Judaism, Brahmanism, Buddhism or Mohammedanism.

All these have originated in Asia, whence man has sprung. In the cradle of humanity, religious monitions gave the first impetus to correct views of society and government, but as man has receded from his ancestral home faith and reason have too widely parted.

Christianity became the faith apostle for the conversion of the Western world from barbaric superstition, and laid with Oriental tenacity for the union of civil and religious rule the foundations of the various governments of Europe. This union upon European soil has hitherto remained unbroken, though combated with great fierceness by the opposition of the rationalistic classes that are striving for the entire change of society. America, as if to be the refuge of unaided reason, remained for ages in the sole possession of the red man of the forest, awaiting that development which civilization had in store for the new continent of the west. It at length became known to the European world, and has formed for centuries the outlet for those who accept as perfect the gospel of humanity. These active missionary propagandists, have been able to plant their views upon American soil to better advantage than was able to be done for them in the home of their conception. When the revolution of 1776—83 ended in national success and in the independence of the united colonies of America, the equalizing and irreligious ideas of Rousseau, and of his French and English compeers, were thoroughly in the ascendant within the limits of the new republic.

The new American Federal Union, after its achievement of independence of British rule, was specially framed, so as to make it a government devoid of all social classification, and free from outside religious influences. It was intended by its framers to embrace simply civil affairs; and all men were declared before the law as equal. The foundation principles embodied in the Constitution and established as its national charter, were simply the digested thoughts of the European rationalists; and which are now showing their corrupting fruits

in all sections of the country, and in all departments of the government. But as there existed at that period, a classification in life, far more marked and distinct than is now found in our country; and one that had been transmitted by European influences; the doctrine of equality propounded by American statesmen, served no higher purpose than to induce the seduction of the masses into the embrace of the dangerous dogma.

The system of slavery that existed in the country, and the aristocratic connections and exclusive demeanor of most of those who avowed themselves as the champions of the new ideas, evinced that no equality was felt, though in loud and express terms the same had been averred. And, it has been so, through all periods of American history. The individuals who declared that all men are created equal, were by no means ready to act out that equality, which they heralded forth as the most solemn truth that could be uttered. Had they, however, permitted the secret ruminations of their own bosoms to appear, it would have been clear that the new gospel was preached in order that the ministry should be enabled to receive at the hands of their deluded auditors loud huzzas and abundant congratulations. The leading magnates of life, in no age or country, have ever believed in human equality; and they will never do so, until destiny shall roll together the scroll of time.

Before proceeding further, the question of human equality would seem appropriately to demand an examination, in order to ascertain what grounds if any exist, for inducing its utterance, as the status of man's nature. If such there be, they should surely be equally perceptible to all reasoning minds; and that they are not so discernible, even when their existence be asserted, is in itself evidence adverse to their assumption. Are men born equal, because they are found to be possessed of equal strength to undergo the labors of life? All are aware that directly the contrary in this illustration is the truth! Again, are they equal in height, in size, in appearance, or in any other physical contour, in which man presents himself to

our imagination? Are they equal in their capacities for acquiring mental discipline or in any of the departments of educational study? Are they equal in their adaptations for business? The mere propounding of these varied queries is sufficient to show the absurdity of the assumption of human equality. Indeed so dissimilar are all men individually from each other, that no two persons can be found, of whom it can with entire truth be said, that they are identically equal. Yea, even amongst members of the same family great dissimilarity often exists. The distinguished Lord Brougham of England says: "The notion of equality, or anything approaching to equality, among the different members of any community, is altogether wild and fantastic."*

But it is popularly supposed, that an equality before the law exists as regards all men, whether the same be great or small, intelligent or illiterate. This equality, however, will in like manner be found to have eluded our grasp, when we come to search for it and see if within itself it possesses any substantial existence. Equality before the law is less expressive than equality before the Creator, for that would signify equality indeed. But the Originator of the Universe, being Himself the Supreme and Omnipotent law-giver, in His all-wise system of procreation and development, has stamped inequality upon the face of universal nature; and did so for the purpose of effecting acquiescence in just and proper authority. He being in Himself superior to all His creation, infinite variety was needed for that proper subordination that is manifestly intended to exist in all life, whether animal or human. Were all beings entirely equal, in all particulars, no rule could obtain, for each individual would feel equally fitted for leadership with all others; and as a consequence in human affairs, that condition which the philosopher Hobbes conceived as the natural one, eternal warfare of every man against his fellow, would become a flagrant reality.

* Brougham's Political Philosophy, vol. 2, page 23.

But as variety in an infinite degree is stamped upon the face of nature, so also is it written upon the tablets of reason; and as imperishable mementoes fixed in the secret convictions of every human existence. It is this hidden monitor that permits government at all to obtain in the affairs of life; and which evinces that men in their consciences, do not in reality believe, as to human equality, what in the hearing of their countrymen, they profess. In no assemblage of men, whether barbarous or civilized, is full equality accepted, as in fact existing. Some are instinctively recognized as leaders, and usually accorded this position; whilst others never aspire to leadership; nor do their fellows fear offense, though declining to propose such in their behalf. But so hypocritical and delusive has life become, that one of these humble individuals would become highly offended, should any one dare to inform him of his unfitness for leadership, of which, however, his own secret conceptions had already fully assured him. And such is the case, because the public, standing declaration has been made, that *all men are created equal*; and because this utterance has been made the foundation of modern republican institutions.

But is this asserted equality before the law the truth, or is it a delusion; and such a one as entails harm and injury upon those believing themselves benefited by it? That it is the latter, some reasons will be given to prove. Equal before the law, should mean something under republican institutions, variant from what the same expression would signify under empires, monarchies, or Asiatic despotisms. And what does it mean? If the poor man is equal to the rich man, then surely he should be entitled to have equal opportunities with him. Does he have the same, however? Can the poor laborer dress as fine, live as sumptuously, keep as delicate and costly liquors in his cellar, or entertain his friends as luxuriantly as the rich millionaire has it in his power to do? But the advocate of equality may say, that the law leaves the poor man and the rich man equal. And to this we reply: then the law of despotic Russia, and that of

the oriental countries do the same. Indeed is not inequality of condition to-day in all nations, just as striking as the biblical parable of Dives and Lazarus shows the same to have existed in antiquity; before political equality was ever surmised as the basis upon which to construct society?

But is the poor man equal with the rich man in all other particulars? Can he with equal advantage aspire for political promotion before his fellow-citizens? Between two candidates of equal character and capacities, and of the same political party, but of different wealth and social position, which is almost sure to receive the favor of his neighbors and acquaintances? Is not the rich candidate almost sure to receive the preference? And yet this occurs in a country where all men are declared as equal before the law. When two young men are ready to engage in business, which of them sets out with most advantages? Is it not he who can command his ancestral wealth and large family influence? But if either have the superior advantage, are they equal before the law? They surely are not. Again, who can litigate before our Courts with the best prospect of success? Is it he who has his thousands at his command, by means of which he is enabled to employ the leading counsel of his town, and even import famed legal gentlemen from other places; or he who must be content to accept the refuse counsel, or the unpaid barrister whom the Court in its benignity may see proper to designate? Whose son, with average talents, can pass a collegiate career, and enter one of the learned professions with the most encouraging prospects of success? Is it the boot-black's son, or he who has been reared inside a palatial residence, with broad, fertile acres around it? The former can only succeed after years of prolonged effort and assiduous application; and then simply by means of the most suppliant clinging to the classes that control business; for the most malicious envy confronts the needy debutant upon his entry into the higher careers of life, which the wealthy and aristocratic instinctively claim as their pe-

culiar domain and inheritance. Individual instances of success from humble beginnings can always be pointed out; but they are ever the exceptions. With equal capacity, attention and perseverance, the man of wealth ever eclipses his competing poorer brother. Yea, the man of wealth, with fair ability, can overtop for a long period his needy intellectual superior; and unless some accidental opportunity fully discloses the latter's greater capacity, he continues indefinitely to carry away the victory over his indigent competitor. The inequalities already pointed out, as every intelligent man can perceive, are the same as exist between rich men and poor men, in all the other civilized countries of the world. There is therefore no human equality in fact, before the law, or elsewhere, in creation. When a government, therefore, is based upon a delusive theory, the best that can be said for it is, that it must fail. For only out of truth can virtue flow.

Equality before the law, simply imports that the inequalities engraven upon the face of creation shall be entirely ignored in legislation; and that society shall constantly be consigned to chaos, in order that the aristocracy of nature, rather than any other kind, may be able to hold in slavery its subordinates. Like the umpire with closed eyes, within an amphitheatre, the law sits and deceptively says to the contestants, great and small, weak and powerful, "Ye are all equal;" but the result soon demonstrates that the strong and athletic ever carry away the victory. The law in seeming to accord to all classes what is called equality, oversteps its power; for its non-interference in the contests of life allows as great inequality to obtain as did under former systems. It stands the indifferent spectator, and permits all kinds of wickedness, crime and dishonor to become factors in the struggles for superiority. In doing so, slavery is by no means eradicated; but a baser class of masters rise to the places of authority, than could do so under the older forms of social existence. Since therefore slavery and inequality are as veritably fixed in the being of modern so-

called free society, as existed in former ages; the inquiry most deserving of attention is this: has the world, at length, secured the most just form of subordination attainable; or that in which justice, right and equity may be able to compete to the best advantage with their contrary evils?

But God Himself never designed equality. His creation based upon due and requisite subordination is so planned, as to have baffled, and ever thwarted all of man's efforts to remedy what He has seen proper to leave, as He has done, for His own wise purposes. With full equality, as before remarked, no dominion were possible, nor could due subordination be secured. The creative architect has made the inequalities which we see in life; and thereby He has evolved harmony, in accordance with the immutable principles of justice. He has created some for rulers, and others to be ruled; or as the ancient philosopher expressed it, some are born masters and others slaves.*

As already intimated, it is an injury to the lower classes in our country, that they should become thoroughly imbued with the belief that they are upon an equality with their rich neighbors and acquaintances. What else is it that induces the large proportion of the poor to labor week after week, and year after year, and expend all their hard earnings in an attempt to keep up appearances? How utterly ruinous does all such conduct prove in the end? By attempting to imitate the rich, do they

* It has become an offense to apply the word slave, to those accustomed to regard themselves as freemen, as contradistinguished from chattels; but language does not in anywise alter facts. The slaves of the Hebrews are not in the Bible designated as such; and yet all scholars are aware that the condition of slavery existed as really amongst the institutions of the Hebrews as amongst those of the Greeks and Romans. The slaves of the Hebrews were designated as servants, a word by no means arousing anger in the breasts of those occupying a subordinate condition. We use the word slave in no intended offensive connection, but as signifying simply the condition of all men, until they have acquired such a pecuniary independence as to enable them and their families to subsist themselves upon their own means, without being at all obliged to court, or depend upon outside assistance or favors.

not simply weld more firmly the chains of slavery upon their own limbs, and entail it as a legacy to their descendants? But he who wisely realizes his condition of slavery, labors and economizes his dearly earned money; and by so doing, eventually emerges from the situation of his birth, and ultimately enjoys freedom indeed. And this ability to rise from the bondage of labor to freedom, is that alone which really characterizes what we designate as *modern slavery* from the systems that have antedated it. And no system of slavery can be entirely a just one, and in harmony with the decrees of creation, which does not contain within its regulations, some avenues of escape for those desirous of, and worthy of a higher calling.

As before shown, it is wholly a delusion that under republican liberty, poor men have better opportunities to break the manacles of their degraded condition, and rise with greater ease to wealth and honor, than can elsewhere be done. In America, in particular, is this deception everywhere current, because of the many instances of the rapid rise of individuals from stations of poverty to honored positions in the land. But the reason why a larger proportion of the lower classes rise to wealth and comfort in republican America, than in imperial Russia, or in monarchical England, is entirely overlooked. It is not the government, but the new and unsettled country, which affords superior advantages for the destitute to lay the foundations and build up their fortunes. Is it not evident, however, to every reflecting mind, that there is an aristocracy of condition in America, similar in its essentials to that which exists in other lands, and which ever has existed, and will continue to do so, except madness supplant reason, and cause that equality which communism is aiming to effect? Indeed aristocracy under republican and monarchical governments differs only in degree and quality, and in no wise in fundamentals. Both have similar roots and propensities; both are germinated in that universal repugnance for human equality which is common to all mankind, and which thereby evinces itself, as God-

implanted in the race. It exists in life, as by instinct, and seems designed to reward the worthy, the industrious and deserving, who most nearly approximate to that partial human perfection within the scope of individual effort. Aristocracy may consist of various kinds. Any phase of it, is that believed superiority acquired over others, which to the possessor affords grounds of satisfaction. It is natural to man, and the direct antipode of human equality. It is simply the result of self-congratulation upon the attainment of any supposed excellence within the reach of man. All objects attainable by human competition, when secured, furnish satisfaction to the successfully competing aspirants; and the attainment of the prizes lays the foundation for what we designate by the name of aristocracy. As to the development of aristocracy, Lord Brougham speaks as follows: "The diversities of human character and genius, the natural propensities of the human mind, the different actions performed by men, or which have been performed by men, or which have been performed by their ancestors, lay the foundations of a natural aristocracy far deeper and far more wide, than any legislative provisions have ever attempted to reach—because no such provisions can possibly obliterate the distinctions, thus created, by the essential nature of man."*

Just dominion and dutiful subordination are complete counterparts of each other, and together are designed to fill the aggregated whole of life, society and government. The one can only be just and the other dutiful, when made to harmonize with equal and exact justice, as the same flows forth from the source of eternal being. God, in accordance with His wise plan, has fitted all men for varied stations and careers, and for this purpose has created all of them dissimilar; no two of them scarcely being found identically similar in all particulars. We see this vast variety, so far as we are able to penetrate, upon the whole face of universal existence. Some men are created to fill the highest roll in life, and others to occupy the lower

* Brougham's Political Philosophy, vol. 2, pp. 23-24.

walks of humility; and to each are assigned the varied feelings, propensities and instincts which severally befit their respective grades and stations, upon the arena of earthly activity. A wise estimator of humanity is ready to assume that each individual, when filling the appropriate sphere allotted to him by his Creator, is most happy and contented; and that he only becomes thoroughly discontented when displaced from that normal groove in society for which nature had adapted him. He fitted for mastery, will undoubtedly chafe, when unjust dominion be exerted over him; and the man born to fill the laborer's roll, will find his greatest human comfort when kindly directed in the midst of his tasks, and relieved to every extent, that superior intelligence and ingenuity are capable of assisting him. When therefore withdrawn from his natural status of subordination in the world, and given the reins of mastery, destruction speedily follows. The question here might appropriately be asked, if there be not men in existence, to whom the assignment of the mastery over themselves does not usually inure to their own destruction, and that of their families? For can he be the best master of himself who fails to comprehend the full requirement and purport of dominion in itself?

But it is dangerous, in this age of believed development and progress, and of imaginary freedom, to intimate that any possible error could lurk beneath the republican or democratic liberty and equality of the nineteenth century. It is, however, well never to be so infatuated with prevailing opinions and impressions, as to be entirely unwilling to hear the discussion of contrary views; as in the world's life, it has often transpired that the ideas of a solitary thinker have revolutionized beliefs and conceptions that have endured for ages. The opinion has become very prevalent, in modern times, that the world has arrived at such a degree of elevation, that all men are fully freed from the chains of bondage; and that time is but required to elevate the lowest classes of society over and above the condition of the most enlightened in former ages. Republican liberty

and equality, and the famed free school-system of America, are believed to be the agencies that are to effect so great and magnificent a revolution. The calm and unenthusiastic observer of society and man is however inclined to doubt the ultimatum of such significant changes, and is tempted to propound the inquiry: if these expectations be, at all, within the range of human possibility. He indeed wonders, if the day is ever to arrive, when the large proportion of mankind will not be, from necessity, as they ever have been, toilers and laborers. At least, he does not conceive that it can be criminal to inquire upon what grounds such stupendous expectations of human elevation can be based; for as believed, they would seem, as if palpable, to the most ordinary observers.

If slavery has entirely disappeared within the range of western civilization, as is claimed, and if an era of republican equality has taken the place thereof, then indeed should we be able to see some of the excellent fruits of this glorious metamorphosis of condition. We would naturally expect to find the citizens to be composed simply of eminent statesmen, judges and distinguished generals, and of such other exalted and enlightened characters as would be worthy to rank with the purest of the sons of men. Of indigent laborers, we should expect to find none; for if modern republicanism has any peculiar equalizing virtues, as compared with other forms of government, elevation above the servile drudgery of labor surely should be one of these. Unfortunately, however, this seems to be one of those evils that are difficult to eliminate from life. But it must be done if modern republicanism ever be able to satisfy the expectations hoped from it; or labor must be made equally honorable and covetable with wealth and luxury. Will they ever become such? Not under the present system of ardent aspiration for the higher departments of life. Universal education, that grand lever that is to elevate mankind far above the most eminent individuals of the dark ages, has many obstacles yet to surmount before it accomplishes what is expected

of it. Can it make all of the coming generations equal in learning and profundity with the St. Augustines and St. Anselms of the medieval epoch? Where will the sustenance of mankind be derived during this period of educating, in so superior a manner, the masses of mankind, up to this high pitch of culture? Methinks a cry for bread will arise that will scatter pedants and pupils far asunder.

Enough has already been said to show the utter absurdity of the attempt to equalize mankind by means of universal education. It cannot be done by that or any other instrumentality. The Creator of the universe never intended this equality; and He has interposed obstacles upon all sides, so that no conceivable means shall ever be able to bring it about. But the unthinking world has been told that equality exists, nevertheless, because it is agreeable to their wishes; and vain and unceasing efforts are made in pursuit of an object that like the *ignis fatuus*, ever eludes the grasp of its pursuers. Universal suffrage has also been put upon the trail of the fond phantom of human aspiration; but this instead of evincing man's equality is the more surely demonstrating his inequality, and that corruption flows from the attempt to seize impossibilities. By means of universal suffrage, the God-ordained systems of dominion and subordination are thrust aside, and the mere conceptions of reason, unimbued with religious influences, substituted.

The question in this connection, naturally presents itself, can society be perpetuated, when a manifest delusion forms its basis, and when religious instrumentalities are entirely laid aside, as forming no necessary portion of governmental machinery? The masses in every country must look to the select few for guidance in ecclesiastical, as well as in worldly affairs; and in a government where no religion is recognized and fostered by the State, a constant decline in church membership will steadily take place. For when the leaders amongst men are seen to pay no devotions to religion, the people come speedily to imi-

tate them. This condition of affairs has already taken place in America; and it will increasingly continue. Morality, honesty and virtue, the cardinal principles of religious belief must also, of necessity, retire from actual life. In America, this has already in a large degree taken place; and now, conscientious men are busied in inquiries, as to what can be done to remedy the deplorable situation.

All, in brief, is the result of permitting sentiment to be molded in accordance with the feelings of the social mob, which has been allowed to become the all-dominant factor in American society and politics. Is this to be permitted indefinitely to continue, without any one daring to sound the trumpet of alarm through dread of that ostracism which each individually fears would drive him beyond the borders of political promotion? In some quarters the scholar has been invoked to enter the arena of politics, without however any definite reasons being assigned, as to why anything is in disorder. The moral reformer has also been named as the one whose services should be employed to help to save the ship of state from apparently impending destruction. All these cries for help indicate that the vessel is nearing certain shoals and quicksands, from which danger may ensue; but they all have so far, failed to call attention to the most pressing dangers, and how they could best be averted. The evils themselves that occasion the most alarm, exist in the fundamentals. A total revolution of existing conditions of society can alone effect the required remedy.

Does that society have a proper existence which the trading politicians carry in their pockets, and dispose of, as they have been doing for years, to the highest bidder? There surely must be something wrong in that section, state or nation, where the degraded and corrupt portion of the community have it in their power to determine who shall be the several nominees, and the elect of the people. When that class of individuals bear sway the worthy and upright members of the body politic must of necessity remain private citizens. And when men of culture

and of upright character have no weight in the selection of the nation's rulers, is not government reduced to a pure sham and mockery? For who in a state or nation have the greater interest in the wise and judicious administration of the public affairs? Is it the men, whose honest accumulations have been carefully husbanded for years, in order that they and their families may have wherewith to guard themselves against the encroachments of want; or they who never added one dollar of their earnings to another, with the view of preserving the same for after years? Government itself is the product of accumulations. For to those who never look to the future, in worldly affairs, all forms of rules become simply despotic deprivations of their imagined liberty. The wild and barbaric state is their natural condition; and progress and accumulation become simply to them oppressive. When, then, civilized society is the result of the industrious and economical incrementations of the sober, steady, persevering classes, into whose keeping should the selection of the rulers be entrusted? Surely not to those whose actual interest in society is felt by themselves to be so insignificant as to be freely bartered for a few six-pence, and often for a draught of rum.

Farewell to liberty, farewell to all stable rule and order, if the officers of government are still in the future as at the present, to be, mainly, the selection of that herd of citizens, who dispose of their votes as of their labor, to the highest bidder. Born slaves, they possess no discernment, as to the proper manner of emerging from their condition in the world; and if they are to continue to be the real rulers, they will keep society as degraded as themselves. For having been taught that they are equal with other men, is it not natural that they should seek to preserve that fancied equality; and this they can only do by electing as rulers those who accept their full creed, and live most in accordance with their own ideas of fraternity. The boisterous, rollicking brawler, has in conformity with modern political tactics become the most successful politician; and he

who by his swaggering familiarities can best ingratiate himself into the good feelings of our American *sans culottes*, is the man that the sagacious partisans must seek out to head their tickets, and defeat that sedate and retiring individual, whose training and culture would amply have fitted for any post of governmental service. The scholar, the cultured gentleman, and the reformer of every grade, sink in popular estimation below par, when it comes to be discussed, who shall be the nominees on the respective party tickets, for the different offices to be filled. An odor of aristocracy seems instinctively to flow from the garments of these classes, and to strike the olfactories of the astute partisans; and as a consequence, the gentry aspirants, as they are termed, are speedily dropped for others, less offensive to the people's leaders. For in the political amphitheatre no such dangerous weapon can be hurled at an adversary, as that styled the *aristocratic charge*. The political aspirant in America, once struck by this fatal javelin, is soon conveyed by his friends to that bourn whence none of his ancestry has ever returned.

Can the sequence of such a political system be aught else than a gradual sinking of the moral tone of society, as we have seen particularly to have been taking place for almost the whole of the last two decades? The fears of Europeans, as well as of Americans, have been aroused as to the perpetuity of republican institutions, in view of the occurrences that have been transpiring in America for the last fifteen or twenty years. George Grote, the historian, a British republican, is recorded by his biographer, as speaking to the following effect: "He once said in conversation with myself, in 1867, about the United States, '*I have outlived my faith in the efficacy of republican government, regarded as a check upon the vulgar passions in a nation; and I recognize the fact that supreme power lodged in their hands, may be exercised quite as mischievously, as by a despotic ruler, like the first Napoleon.*'"* That a great change

* Personal Life of Grote, p. 314.

has taken place in America, thinkers everywhere are beginning to see. Charles Ingersoll, an eminent Philadelphian, in a late production, says: "We know, and only a great public change can account for it, that in the revolution of 1776, a country of some three millions of people, produced illustrious men; and in that of 1860, the same country, ten times as populous, did not produce one. No merit appeared, that was not military. We know that Washington offered the Department of State to nine different persons, of various politics, all of whom declined the first place in the government. We know that now, the appetite for place is universal."* W. G. Dix, another American author, speaks of the depression of moral tone in the following manner: "The fact is humiliating, that the tone of American life is lower since the war, which was supposed to be about to usher in a new era of national honor and culture, than it was before. It may be indeed, that we are in a state of transition from higher to lower aims; but the transition is very bewildering, and lasts a very long time. The promised light refuses to come. The days grow darker every day, and the thoughtful patriot can dimly see little more than a broad and dismal waste, crowded with men ravenous for gain, while those who desire and seek better things, are trampled under foot like dogs." †

In order to remedy the existing evils of government, as they are displaying themselves upon all sides in America, a proper form of dominion must be established; and therewith, that due subordination which equity and duty require. And many have recently propounded to their own reason the inquiry, if this can ever be effected under the existing institutions, beneath whose colors we are now sailing. That a radical revolution of some form or other, must take place in our country, before the government can be made to perform its appropriate functions, is becoming more and more evident to every reflecting mind. And although little likelihood exists, that such changes can in

* *Fears for Democracy*, pp 121, 122.

† *Dix's American State*, p. 15.

any manner peacefully be brought about; and although destiny therefore seems to be reserving us for a terrible ordeal in the career of fate, and which by no means can probably be averted; nevertheless duty invokes her devotees to labor to counteract the threatening destruction, and to do so to the utmost of their ability. But all effort, in any wise, to prevent the coming disaster, appears indeed to the most sanguine as almost hopeless. For the American Union is freighted with all the hopes of humanity for republican government; and the cargo is esteemed too valuable and important ever to be unladen, short of universal shipwreck, until the ruler of nations shall have clearly signified His will, as to the vessel's ultimate destination. That ruler has for years been writing significant signs upon the face of time, as if to admonish the American people that something is fundamentally wrong in their affairs; but to turn back, as it is esteemed, the modern world is wholly adverse; and no other method of escape from the impending destruction appears to have presented itself to the clearest discerner of the future.

Modern republicanism as manipulated, in itself, is a revolt against the ordained order of society; and the American Union will be the arena, upon which, in all probability, its natural fruits will most fully mature. Because no fountain, nor refuge for honor exists in the country, almost all Americans, of necessity, bend their efforts to the accumulation of riches; a struggle no more noble in itself, than could sordid gain, were it capable to do so, esteem its own base existence. Again, what bulwark has independent opinion, in America, to which it can triumphantly point, when it happens to run counter to that which is popular? It simply has none. As a consequence, extremely few indeed ever hazard the utterance of sentiments which they perceive will only subject them to social and political ostracism. And indeed, the man who does so, is esteemed by his friends and acquaintances, as destitute of that prudence which should characterize the conduct of every individual. The politicians who aim to be leaders, will express no opinion, that might in

any event, render them unpopular. Newspaper editors usually observe the same reticence, as regards the avowal on their part of obnoxious opinions. How then in America is the truth to be disseminated, if it be unpalatable to the dominant masses? Truth in the European monarchies, as the philosopher Buckle informs us, is not so crushed, as in the boasted land of so-called free America. Until some power, therefore, be found in America that will be able to afford a defense for the most obnoxious truth that may be spoken, and form a retreat and full recognition for the loftiest impulses of humanity, she must remain as at present, the forlorn desert, parching and withering all the inspiring motives of man's noblest nature.

It is no wonder that our country can lay no claim to a specific American development. She will never be able to do so, under her present regime, unless her thirst for money-getting can be characterized as such. But she must soar higher in the realities of being, and aspire towards the attainment of nobler objects, than those of mere sensual gain, before she will be able to enroll herself as a self-developing nationality within the world's arena. Where are her schools of art, of history, of criticism, and of philosophy? America can count almost by the thousand, her compilers of school books, because money rewards so abundantly, those who successfully engage in this branch of literature. But can her criticism point to a Chevalier Bunsen, a Baur of Tubingen, or a Wm. Von Humboldt? Noble impulses inspired this class of authors to engage in their arduous researches. But how many shelves in our libraries are filled with American books, written from a higher motive than despicable greed? Genius soars aloft to Olympus, that she may sip nectar with the gods, and disdains to be held burrowing in the earth for gold. She has, however, inspired but few Americans to follow her in her aerial flights. Where can the land of Washington point to her Raphael or Michael Angelo? What sect of philosophy has been founded by her Bacon, her Leibnitz, her Kant, her Hegel, her Fichte, or her

Schelling? She has simply compelled the noblest conceptions of her nature to find scope in her industrial and mechanical activities; and there they must remain until the republican revolution has reached its goal, and ended its world-mission.

That country can never have a development that fully accepts the doctrine of human equality, and ignores that recognition of genius, which alone contributes to the world's highest life. All distinctions being forbidden in our country, there is nothing that can evoke heroic effort within the quiet walks of life. Hence all the heroism of our being is either chilled or reserved at best for expenditure upon fields of barbarous warfare. In civil life, all the incentives of man's nature should be called into activity. All these, however, are driven from America, and must remain in exile, until the day arrives, when for the institutions of the present, a God-ordained dominion and subordination are substituted; when the ecclesiastical will be as highly appreciated as the civil governor, and assigned to as exalted a seat; and when each individual will be allotted to that appropriate sphere of activity, for which nature has chosen him; then, and not till then, will America fully commence her real career of development. Until that period arrives, she is simply able to mass her efforts, and arrange her forces to be in readiness when her ennobled nature will permit that denouement, which the struggling energies of her crushed being are longing to essay.

ART. III.—H A D E S.

HADES, or the intermediate state is a subject involved in a great deal of mystery, and around which hangs considerable darkness, that cannot be fully penetrated. It is different from all other subjects, because it is not only dark to us, but it is itself the abode of darkness and death. For centuries has it been a bone of contention in the Christian Church. Though much has been written on the subject, its doctrine, still involved in much obscurity, is by no means settled, neither is our relation to that abode clearly defined in the Christian consciousness.

The Bible as well as our experience teaches us convincingly every day, that death is the common destiny of all mankind, but the time of dissolution is the special prerogative of God, which He has kept from the knowledge of man. It is not for us to know when, where, or under what circumstances that solemn and painful separation of body and soul may overtake us. In view of this undeniable fact, we should give heed to the solemn injunction of our Saviour to "watch and pray," in order to be able and ready to meet death, without fear and trembling. So powerful and irresistible is death, and so impartial in his operations and overwhelming in his influence, that he is justly called the king of terrors. His universal sway lays men of every rank and position in the dust. Every time we hear the solemn toll of the Church-bell, or stand at the open grave, we are reminded that another soul has left its earthly tabernacle, has bid adieu to this world with all its changing scenes, has winged its flight to that invisible world from whence it will never return. And since all men are subject unto death, and shall rise again at the last day, and stand before the great judge, to render an account of the deeds done in the body,

whether they be good or whether they be bad, and receive a just recompense of reward, is it not, therefore, highly proper to study the nature and constitution of man, and learn as far as possible what his eternal destiny is? We naturally inquire what becomes of the soul when it leaves the body? What is its destination? In what condition will it be during the long interval of time elapsing between death and the resurrection, when body and soul will be reunited?

The generally received opinion is that the soul as soon as it leaves the body enters at once into heaven or hell. But if this were so, its happiness or misery would at once be complete, and the resurrection, as well as the general judgment would have neither meaning nor force, and the word "dead" would have to be dropped from the Creed.

We know that there are some who, not only deny the Resurrection of the body, but even the immortality of the soul, and pretend, at least, to find relief in the gloomy and inglorious doctrine of the utter annihilation of the soul. This theory might be plausible if man was no more than a bird or a beast. But man is an intelligent and thinking being, beautifully and wonderfully made; he is more than the beast, or mere animal matter. Those qualities and powers which raise him above animals, he received by the inbreathing of the soul from his Creator, and thus from above and beyond the brute creation. In regard to the brute creation it is written, "Out of the ground the Lord God formed every beast of the field and every fowl of the air." But in reference to man it is written, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness." Into man thus created, we are told, God breathed the "breath," not of life, but "of lives,"—the immortal spiritual life,—and man became a living soul." Man is a compound being, because he is possessed of body and soul, having an animal and a spiritual life. He differs, therefore, from all other creatures, because he is in possession of two lives, while the brutes have but one. He differs thus from other creatures in his entire constitution in body, soul and spirit, being made in the image of God.

Adam "bears the name, (in Hebrew), of the race itself; and it is under this generic title particularly that he is presented to our notice in the sacred history of the Bible. His individual personality of course was limited wholly to himself. But a whole world of like separate personalities lay involved in his life, at the same time, as a generic principle or root. And all these, in a deep sense, form at last but one and the same life. Adam lives in his posterity, as truly as he has ever lived in his own person. They participate in his whole nature, soul and body, and are truly bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh." *

Being endowed with a material body and an imperishable soul, man alone of all creatures was destined for immortality. That he, though fallen from his integrity, shall exist for ever, and await the general resurrection and judgment, is clearly stated in the Bible. That he is subject unto misery and death is no less manifest from the same source, as well as from experience. For "by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned," in Adam and Eve. Death lodged in the very inmost constitution of man's nature as he separated himself from his Creator. Sin is the sting of death. It is not only painful but full of terrors. And it is only when it is ravished of this sting, that we can die in peace, triumphing over death, and him that hath the power of death.

Man's falling into sin and death is not to be regarded as a symbolical picture merely, but as literal history, without, however, entirely overlooking its symbolical meaning. But the meaning of the historical fact lies not in the outward fact merely, but in the interior sense. Sin in its primary conception is something spiritual. The act of the apostacy is in the mind or will. Yet this act had to externalize itself under a proper form of expression. This historical transaction must be regarded as having literally taken place. We are not to suppose that there was a special quality in the tree itself. But

* Dr. Nevin's *Mystical Presence*, p. 161.

the knowledge of good and evil was the experiment of sin, and brought with it a knowledge of good in the way of negation or want, and a knowledge of evil by experience. Man had some knowledge of good before his fall, but not so as to know what its opposite was. He had to come to a clear consciousness of sin. The tree of the knowledge of good and evil was the point where the consciousness of good and evil divided itself. This tree had an objective power, rather sacramental than natural, which shows that the whole narrative carries with it a symbolical sense, allowing that there was a literal tree.

On the other hand, the tree of Life had a sacramental character, not that it possessed any virtue as such, neither was it useless. It was the holy and visible sign of immortality. This gift was suspended on the proper use of it. All this goes to show that man was not in the proper possession of that happy or fixed immortality at first, *per se*, but was to become so by his relation to the world. But this relation might be defeated. It does not just come from creation, but was to be conferred upon him subsequently. By the fall he lost his title to immortality, though this immortality is now secured to him by the fact of its being made good to him in Christ. It required then as now, that man's probation must be successfully passed before he could participate in the divine nature, and be endowed with such a heaven-born gift. Man's probationary period having passed, he could have used the Tree of Life, and the use of it would have been a sacramental transaction, through which he would have reached immortality. Man being excluded from the use of the tree of life, was also excluded from immortality. The relation between the tree of life and immortality was just as real as that between the tree of the knowledge of good and evil in its consequences. The tree of life had no power to confer immortality on Adam the sinner, but it had power to confer it on Adam the saint.

Again, the transgression of the law of God on the side of Adam was not a single act of Adam alone, but was a universal

act, which overthrew the whole authority of God's law. And the immediate consequence of this transgression was, that it opened their eyes, and they saw that they were naked—that is, they had a consciousness of their fallen state.

This fall brought upon our first parents all the effects of God's threatened penalty, "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." The fall brought them, and with them *the race*, under the power of death physically, spiritually and eternally. "Our death is not a simple dissolution, nor a separation of soul and body, as Christ's was, but our whole tabernacle is fully dissolved, and every part thereof crumbled into the dust and ashes, scattered, mingled, and confounded with the dust of the earth." Man now doomed by his sin, was driven from Paradise, and the tree of life was strictly guarded by Cherubims, so that he could not return and eat of it and live forever, in his fallen and sinful nature. This would seem to imply, (and there is nothing impossible in the supposition), that this fruit was endued with the virtue of fortifying their constitution against the decays of age; and its constant use would have kept their mortal bodies from dissolution. And that they did eat of the tree of life, would also seem to account for the longevity of the antediluvians.*

The effects of Adam's fall did not end in his own person, but extended to his posterity. Adam was the federal head of the race, and God ordained that he should transmit his nature to his offspring, whatever that nature might be. If he remained holy, he would transmit to them a holy nature, but, that, if he became sinful, he must, of necessity, transmit to them a sinful nature, and this decision was to be made before a single being was born. Adam fell, and "when he begat children, he transmitted to them, not the sinless nature which he possessed originally, but the sinful nature he received the moment he transgressed. Hence the fountain of human nature became poisoned at its source; the root of human nature became evil before a

* Bishop Whateley's Future State, p. 15.

single branch or bud had sprung out of it. Hence when Adam begat children, they were in his likeness. Hence all mankind are sinners from the womb."*

The fact of the fall was no doubt comprehended in the plan of God from the beginning, and interwoven into the constitution of the world, though not resulting from a foreordination, but springing from the free election of man himself. And Redemption was to be reached through this result.

In order to have a proper idea of death, as a result of that fall, we must regard it as a state of darkness, obstruction and limitation, coming only to its complete sense in the intermediate state. This would have been an eternal state without the Gospel. The work of Christ was not only to free man from sin, but also to bring him out of the intermediate state. Without His descent into Hades, Christ's victory over death and hell would not have been complete. The Scriptures recognize four sorts of deaths. The separation from God, the fountain source of all life, is the very essence of each sort of deaths. But as soon as one link of the chain, which united God to man was broken, the ravages of death began their work of destruction, so that not only Adam but the whole human race must die. Having incurred the first kind of death, we become liable to the other three. The second sort of death, is the physical death which we must all experience. Here we have two deaths, both of which belong to this present world. "They are the natural inheritance of every child of fallen Adam. We enter the world in the one, our departure from the world is the result of the other. The other two deaths are experienced in the next world. The one comes to pass in *Hades*, and the other in *Gehenna*. The death in Hades begins at the decease of a wicked man, and terminates at the morning of the resurrection. The death in Gehenna commences immediately after the day of judgment, and is endless in duration. Such, then, are the deaths recognized by, and so frequently spoken of in the word of God."†

* Sadler on the Second Adam, p. 10.

† Dr. Bartle on Hades, p. 148-9.

The inquiry into the abode of departed spirits has in a great measure been neglected by protestant divines, partly, perhaps, from fear of being accused of holding the doctrine of purgatory, or of being called a Romanist. We should, however, not lose sight of so important a fact or link in the great work of redemption, which is so clearly implied in the Bible statements, and made an article of faith, which is Sunday after Sunday repeated in many congregations. If we had nothing to do, or were not directly concerned with that state which lies between death and the resurrection, we should probably waste no time in the investigation of so unprofitable a subject. When we are about to emigrate to a new and distant country where we have never been, wisdom requires us to make all possible inquiry as to the nature of that country and our wants there; having learned this, we provide ourselves with all the necessary means to make our habitation there as comfortable as possible. Should we not then be much more circumspect in making the most ample provision when we are about to go to the spirit-land, from whence we shall *never*, never return? And since we are certain one day to enter this invisible and mysterious region of the dead, and probably remain there for centuries prior to the morning of the resurrection, it appears to me both reasonable and desirable that we should strive to know something about the condition of our spiritual existence between death and the resurrection.

That there is such an intermediate state of existence is earnestly denied and contended against by some, while it is with equal earnestness defended by others. That there is such a place for disembodied souls is certainly no fancy of philosophy, but a fact which is grounded on reason and truth itself. It is expressly taught in the Apostles' Creed, which, in regard to its soul and substance is the very embodiment of those divine truths which the Apostles taught and believed. It is true, the words, "He descended into hell," meaning Hades, were not embodied in the Creed until about the end of the fourth century,

but they had long before been accepted by the great body of the early Church as an article of faith. "It is most certain *that Christ descended into hell*; and as infallibly true as any other Article of the CREED."* The Church of England made it an Article of religion, and all who received holy orders were obliged to subscribe to it. They had it even set to metre, and sung in their devotional meetings. †

I. In this article it is not our intention to give a history of the development of the doctrine of Hades; this has been done at several different times; but to look more particularly into the fact itself, as the Church and the Bible present it for our faith. That Christ descended into Hades may not only be inferred from doubtful passages of the Bible, but from its general tenor, as well as from its positive statements. And if Christ descended into Hades, He went there for some special purpose. The Church fathers all agree that the soul of Christ descended into the habitation of the souls of the departed. But the *persons to whom* He descended, and the *object for which* He descended has always been a point of difference. Some very ingenious, other very ridiculous and unreasonable expositions have been given in regard to His descent, which we do not desire to notice here; even that He went there to relieve the damned. But if Hades is in the realm of darkness and death, Christ must have gone there to ravish death of its sting, and to free the saints from

* Pearson on the Creed, p. 347.

† "And so He died in the flesh,
But quickened in the Spirit:
His body then was buried,
As is our use and right.

His spirit did after this descend
Into the lower parts,
Of them that long in darkness were,
The true light of their hearts."

its power, and in order to do this, He as *their substitute* had to suffer the pains of hell for them.

But we remark again, that because of this substitute, who transfuses the fruits of His victory into His people, death in the believers' circumstances is not what it is in the unbelievers'. In the believers' case death does not reach the proper citadel of their life, and is followed by the resurrection, which is for the righteous the breaking forth of a higher life, of which they had been formerly the subjects.

On account of his rupture with God, man, it is true, must die, but his soul passes over into another state of existence, where it is detained, perhaps, thousands of years, until the resurrection day. He makes His abode, not in Heaven properly so called, but in Hades, will only issue thence when the archangel's trump shall announce the approaching Judge, when the sea, death and Hades shall deliver up the dead which are therein; when the present abode of departed spirits shall be cast into the lake of fire. (Rev. xx. 13, 14). This is the *second or spiritual death*. (Rev. xx. 14).

This region of departed spirits we call Hades. Hades means the intermediate state; the place or state in which the souls are confined between death and the resurrection, or final judgment. In a word, Hades means the place of departed spirits. Though we use the word place, we are not able to fix the locality, neither are we able to fix the locality of heaven. When the question is asked, where then, is Hades? all we can say is, that it exists somewhere in the universe. But what relation the spirits dwelling there hold to time and space we cannot tell; certainly not the same which our bodies now hold, for they are disembodied spirits.

In the Old Testament the word *Sheol* was used to describe this state and place. It was regarded as meaning a cavity, a hollow subterranean place. Lange in his Commentary says, the "closer definition of the descending evidently indicates the depths of the lower world, the subterranean world, which is

below the surface of the earth." This is no doubt the reason why all who die are said to go down or descend, and returning thence is called rising from the dead. (Gen. xxxvii. 33-35). Jacob said, in reference to his son Joseph, believing the report of his wicked sons, "I will go down into Hades * unto my son, mourning." In Gen. xv. 15, God said to Abraham, "Thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace, thou shalt be buried in good old age." He certainly did not mean that Abraham should be buried with his ancestors, because he was buried in Machpelah, and no one was at that time buried there but his wife Sarah. But he must have meant that Abraham at death should go into Hades, to the souls of his forefathers. The last words, "Thou shalt be buried in good old age," have reference to the interment of his body. In Gen. (xxv. 8), it is said, "Then Abraham gave up the ghost, and died in good old age, an old man, and full of years; and was gathered to his people." In Numbers (xvi. 33), we read about the earth opening her mouth, when Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, "and all that appertained to them went down *alive* into Hades, and the earth closed upon them, and they perished from among the congregation." And Paul says, "That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and on earth, and under the earth."

By the things in heaven are no doubt meant all the angels; by the things on earth are denoted men, and even devils; while those under the earth signify the separate souls of men in Hades. All these passages seem clearly to indicate that the locality of Hades is underneath the earth, if taken literally. But all such expressions must be regarded rather relatively than literally, being borrowed from the common expressions of life. We can after all that has now been said make no geographical boundaries or local limitation for heaven or the intermediate state.

The souls in that region still sustain a close relation to this

* This word is wrongfully translated grave, pit and hell in the Old and New Testaments.

world. To exclude them from it implies that their salvation is complete at death, not needing the resurrection. They must be subject to the laws of this world, though they have gone to the spirit-land, for death is not a transfer to another economy. Heaven and the intermediate state are not lying outside, but are embraced in our present economy; otherwise there could be no resurrection, for this is the full restoration of life under the form that carries out and completes our human system.

By fastening our minds too much upon an intermediate *place*, however, we would at last be compelled to admit a 'second state of probation, involving either purgatory or a condition of sleep, or the notion of darkness, limitation and obstruction under the Christian economy. This would leave Hades in almost the same condition as it was before Christ's descent. But we are authorized by the Bible to regard the intermediate state after Christ's descent and victory as a place of light and happiness for the righteous.

We also conceive of the departed dead as being around us. But wherever they may be, the intermediate state is in the realm of death, where all is ripening at the same time for the outburst of a higher life, in which this mortal shall put on immortality, and the righteous stand forth as the perfect men in that higher life, which was before lodged in them as members of Christ's mystical body.

But on the other hand we regard Hades also as a state in which the souls are confined and conditioned until the resurrection morning. There may be a preparation in the intermediate state for the resurrection; so far as it may be a probationary state. As this state is one of freedom from sin and positive happiness for the saints, it is called Paradise, by Christ Himself. (Luke xxiii. 43). Paradise means a garden of pleasure, or a region of supreme felicity, full of delicious fruits. We may then speak of believers in this state as being in heaven, yet we must not confound this with the idea of the resurrection heaven. The condition of Hades is one of loss and want, and

belongs to the power and realm of death. Death causes the separation of soul and body, and involves, consequently, the idea of want. The resurrection is represented as the deliverance from death and Hades, and consequently commences in the intermediate state. This state is not one of suffering for the saints, because by virtue of their union with Christ, who triumphed over death and Hades, they, the believers of the Old and New Testament, will triumph over it also. The Old Testament saints may be said to have triumphed over it prophetically. This prophecy has been beautifully illustrated and established by Christ's descent into Hades, and His triumph over its power; so that its character of limitation, darkness and obstruction has been overthrown, and in its place has come comparative light and happiness for His people. Hades must not be regarded merely as a condition, but also as a place or locality. Heaven is a definite locality as well as a state, so is the nether world.

"The doctrine of immortality in the Bible, is such as to include always the idea of the resurrection. The whole argument in the 15th chapter of 1st Corinthians, as well as the representation, 1 Thess. iv. 13-18, proceeds on the assumption that the life of the *body*, as well as that of the soul, is indispensable to the perfect state of our nature as human. The soul then, during the intermediate state, cannot possibly constitute, in the biblical view, a complete man; and the case requires besides, that we should conceive of its relation to the body as still in force, not absolutely destroyed but only suspended. The whole condition is interimistic, and by no possibility of conception capable of being thought of as complete and final."*

This doctrine, if properly apprehended, throws a great deal of light upon many otherwise dark and inexplicable passages of Scripture, which only become intelligible by a proper understanding of the abode of departed spirits. It is true, our rela-

* Dr. Nevin's *Mystical Presence*, p. 171, note.

tion and condition in that abode is not so fully stated as our inquiring minds might desire, yet enough is given to make it an article of faith. In the economy of salvation, as in nature, we must take many things by faith. But if God's plan of Redemption is to be regarded as organic, then there must be an organic relation between the living and the dead. The saints in the intermediate state must stand in some connection with the present world, and with the saints on earth. They cannot be complete without us, as Watts beautifully says :

"The saints above, and all the dead
But one communion make,
Joined to Christ, their living head,
And of His grace partake."

That Christ is the federal head and *substitute* for *man* is perfectly true ; but to make the atonement consist simply and absolutely in His death upon the cross on Calvary, because He said, "*It is finished*," must ever indicate a most imperfect and superficial acquaintance with the deeper meaning of the Bible. Nor can the doctrine of substitution, in any proper sense of the word, be made to harmonize with such views. "After this, Jesus, knowing that all things were now accomplished, that the Scripture might be fulfilled, saith, I thirst." Now "all things" here spoken of can only be understood as referring to His earthly sufferings up to that particular time. For there were many other prophecies concerning Him which were not yet fulfilled, but all those up to His death on the cross were now fulfilled, even to the giving of vinegar.

As a general thing, very little positive information is given in the Bible in reference to the detention of departed spirits within the confines of any region, distinct from heaven or hell, during the interval elapsing between the time of death and the day of judgment. Nevertheless we have not a single passage in the Bible, from which it may be directly or indirectly

inferred, "that the soul of man, on its departure from the body, goes immediately into Heaven or Hell, *properly so-called.*"

Heaven proper, or the place of beatific vision, into which no mortal eye can penetrate, nor imperfect creature enter, where God and all higher spirits are peculiarly at home, where the redeemed of earth shall dwell in eternal felicity, is only reached after the resurrection when our whole personality in body, soul and spirit is fully restored in Christ Jesus.

There is but one passage into Hades, but when that gate is passed, the just enter into the upper, and the unjust into the lower compartments, the one into happiness, the other into misery.* Lazarus died, "and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom," and safely housed in blissful repose, or as some have designated it, into blessedness, but not glory. "*Abraham's bosom* is not heaven, though it will issue in heaven, so neither is Hades '*hell*,' though to issue in it, when death and Hades shall be cast into the lake of fire, which is the proper hell."† (Rev. xx. 14). And as Abraham's bosom has a foretaste of heaven, so has the other place a foretaste of hell. The saints here, without any pain, look forward with holy anticipation towards the resurrection and glorification of their bodies, and their eternal rest and glory in their closer union with God Himself.

Hades is, therefore, a region in which the good and the bad are not intermingled as in the present world, but they are separated by a "great gulph," over which they can never pass. (Luke xvii. 26). It would be highly unjust to jumble together the righteous and the wicked in the intermediate state, for such a mixture would unavoidably cause an interference, and mar the happiness of the saints. In our probationary state on earth the good and bad are unavoidably intermingled with one another. But in death this relation ends, and each one is sent to that apartment adapted to its life on earth. Even in this

* See Josephus on Hades.

† Trench on the Parables, p. 379.

world the righteous have no pleasure in the fellowship of the wicked, beyond what our probationary state requires, and would certainly desire to have less beyond the grave.

We have already a symbolical representation in the Old Testament of what this region will be. When darkness covered the land of Egypt, the children of Israel had light; when death was in every house, and weeping and wailing throughout Egypt, the children of Israel had joy, though, yet in bondage, the hope of deliverance was drawing nigh. The power which held them in bondage had already been broken.*

Besides, the mixture of such men as Cain and Abel, Judas and Paul, the holy martyrs and heathens and infidels would not only be unjust, but it would also produce the utmost confusion, and make their second stage worse than the first. Moreover, in the parable of the wheat and tares, the Lord commands His servants to let both stand until the harvest time,—the end of the world,—for fear of injuring the wheat. But at harvest time they shall gather the tares and bind them in bundles to burn them, but the wheat they shall gather into His barns.

Dives and Lazarus are another case in point clearly establishing this principle. Dives saw Lazarus in Abraham's bosom *afar off*, but the distance or gulph is so great that it is impossible to pass over. We are also taught in Revelation, that blessed are the dead, who die in the Lord, and that they shall rest from their labors, while their works do follow them. (Rev. xiv. 13). Here the wicked cease from troubling, and the weary are at rest.

* "With them was identified, in a peculiar sense, the honor of God and the cause of heaven; and the power that oppressed and afflicted them, was trampling at every step on rights which God had conferred, and provoking the execution of a curse which He had solemnly denounced. If the cause and blessing of heaven were bound up in the Israelites, then Pharaoh, in acting towards them as an enemy and oppressor, must of necessity have espoused the interest and become liable to the doom of Satan."—Fairbairn's Typology, p. 38, Vol. II.

We conclude from these facts, as well as from the general tenor of Scripture, that the good and bad are separated in death; though in the same region, yet divided; the one in light and happiness, the other in darkness and miserable. "There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth, when ye shall see Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets, in the kingdom of God, and you yourselves thrust out." It is apparent that these spirits can see each other *afar off*, and are able to converse, and hear one another, in spite of the great gulph between them, which they cannot pass. The righteous dead can certainly find no pleasure in the society of the wicked; it is even so in this world, and will be more so in the next. In Proverbs (xv. 11) we are told, that "Hades and destruction are in the presence of Jehovah." From this we conclude that the souls of the saints in Hades are in the presence of Christ, enjoying that blessed state which they only anticipated while in the flesh.

The intermediate state is also a state of consciousness, and not one of sleep. Some contend that the only possible supposition is, that "the soul remains in a state of profound sleep—of utter unconsciousness—during the whole interval between its separation from the body by death, and its reunion at the resurrection."* That the soul should sleep is a most gloomy and comfortless doctrine for those who have friends in the spirit-world. It is horrible even to suppose that the soul will remain in an unconscious state for thousands of years until its resurrection morning and final reunion with the body. This is not in conformity to the doctrine of one of blessed memory in the Reformed Church, who had devoted seven of the best years of his life to the thorough investigation of this subject. Another says, "The soul of man, which, while he lived, gave life to the body, and was the fountain of all vital actions, in that separate existence after death, must not be conceived to sleep, or be bereft and stripped of all vital operations, but still to exercise

* Archbishop Whateley, D. D., On the Future State, p. 80.

the powers of understanding and of willing, and to be subject to the affections of joy and sorrow. Upon which is grounded the different estate and condition of the souls of men during the time of separation; some of them by the mercy of God being placed in peace and rest, in joy and happiness; others by the justice of the same God left to sorrow, pains, and misery."* As there are different kinds of men in this life, the wicked and the just, so there are two societies of souls after death.

Man at his creation had breathed into himself not a life, but lives, a natural or animal life, and a spiritual life. Thus "every man is bound to pass through three stages before he reaches his final home, or destination; and in each stage he never loses his personal identity, because it is a continuation of the same life and same consciousness which never leave him, for, if they did, he could not be the very identical person. The first of these gradations is realized at man's natural birth, or when he is born into this world; and, for distinction's sake, I call this development his *temporal* birthday. The second mighty change is effected when the soul and body are severed from each other by the cold hand of death, the latter being committed to the ground, 'in sure and certain hope of the resurrection to eternal life,' and the former returning to God; and this state in human existence I designate man's *intermediate* birthday, which extends from the time of death till that of the resurrection. The final, or third change, which man is compelled to undergo, comes to pass at the morning of the resurrection, or the universal Easter, when the bodies and souls of all men shall be reunited; and this change I denominate man's *eternal* birthday."† By the term death, then, as applied to a human being, we are to understand nothing more than a temporary disunion, or suspension of life between a mortal and an immortal nature, or the separation of a perishing body from an imperishable soul.

* Bishop Pearson on the Creed, p. 356.

† Dr. Bartle on Hades, pages 57-8.

The saints are said to go to sleep at death. This refers to their awakening or resurrection morning, and not to their condition in the intermediate state. So it is said of Stephen (Acts vii. 60), whom the enemies of Jesus were stoning, that he "fell asleep." This relates two facts, Stephen's death and the certainty of his resurrection. So Lazarus, and the damsel were said to sleep, indicating that they should rise again. If the soul sleeps, how comes it to pass that our Lord went to the spirits in prison, and yet did not sleep? If the dead were in a state of insensibility in Hades, the saints would be absolutely incapable of enjoyment. And the wicked would enjoy a long rest, and the condition of the one would be little better than that of the other. In Isaiah (lvii. 1, 2), the separate souls are said to walk in their uprightness, and in several places in the Book of Revelation they are represented as worshipping God, *singing and crying aloud*, and serving God day and night (Rev. vii. 15). How can these disembodied spirits do this if they are in a profound sleep and absolutely insensible? If the soul sleeps during its separate condition how could Moses and Elias have come to the Mount of Transfiguration? (Matt. xvii. 1-3.)

Moreover, what meaning would there be in the Saviour's dying language on the cross to the penitent malefactor, saying, "To-day thou shalt be with me in Paradise?" He certainly did not mean that the malefactor should that day be with Christ in Paradise asleep and unconscious. Besides, God is not a God of the dead but of the living; if the souls were sleeping, we might say that they existed, but we could not with propriety assert that they *lived unto God*.

Again, if the soul sleeps it can take no interest in the welfare of those whom it leaves behind. But we know from the parable of the rich man and Lazarus that Dives prayed for himself and his five brethren whom he left behind.

These reasons seem to prove sufficiently that the intermediate state is not one of sleep or unconsciousness, but one of happiness or misery as the case may be.

We also maintain that the dead in the spirit would recognize each other. The account given by our Lord of the two representative characters of the human race, Dives and Lazarus, proves most clearly this assertion. Without this, the condition of the righteous would be infinitely worse than it is on earth. Besides, man is a social being, and not to recognize each other in the spiritual world would be tantamount to depriving the soul of happiness. If the past were blotted out we would stand on the eternal shore as a new creation, rather than as a being that had a previous life and history, and that had just entered upon another stage of being. There is no meaning in a crown when memory tells me of no victory won. That there is no recognition out of the body is therefore a most comfortless doctrine, and supposes a most gloomy condition of the soul.*

Moreover, we hold that the departed not only know each other, but that they also know what is going on on earth, and take an interest in the welfare of those whom they have left behind. For in this same parable we again hear Abraham say to Dives, "Son, remember that thou in thy lifetime receivest thy good things," putting him in mind of what had transpired in his earthly existence. From this we infer that we carry a full recollection from the earth to the spirit world. And that the rich man did so remember is clear from the language of his prayer which he afterward offered for his father's house and his five brethren; every one of whom he knew was living a life of sin. It is natural to suppose that a soul liberated from a perishing body will be quicker, clearer and more active in its perception, and will not know less than it did while hampered with a perishable body. We may then infer that the wicked have a distinct recollection of all their family matters, at least up to the time of their death, but they may even have a full knowledge beyond, though in a state of gloomy anticipation of the future. They are represented as in full activity, for Isaiah

* See Dr. Harbaugh's work on Heavenly Recognition.

(xiv. 9) says, "Hell from beneath is moved for thee to meet thee at thy coming: it stirreth up the dead for thee."

In reference to the righteous dead, they undoubtedly know what takes place on earth, probably of themselves, if not, at least, through their close communion with God and the holy angels, who will not withhold earthly tidings, but illuminate them (Rev. xxii. 5), and especially so if these tidings will increase their joy. We feel justified in drawing this conclusion from the parables of the Lost Sheep and the Ten Pieces of Silver recorded in St. Luke xv. 3-10, and from the prayers offered by the saints, recorded in Rev. vi. 10. Moreover, they would also have the communication of those who come every moment from earth to the region of the blessed.

Besides, it would also seem that the blessed are not affected in their happiness in the spirit world, by the misfortune of the wicked, for we do not see that Lazarus is moved the least in the way of pity toward the rich man in his sufferings.

Again, if Dives prayed in Hades for his five brethren, will not the righteous in Hades also pray for their friends? If we believe it on the one side, we are forced to admit it on the other. If it is done by the wicked, though without effect, is it not more natural to believe that it is effectually done by the righteous? (Rev. vi. 10.) Though we have but little express information concerning the saints, and their capacities in the spirit world, this is no evidence that they know nothing of us. They are raised higher, and possess capacities superior to ours. "The intelligent naturalist looks down upon the lower orders of living beings, sees their movements, and understands their habits, though they know nothing of him. That the saints do thus look down upon us, seems to be evident from Heb. xii. 1; where the ancient saints are represented as surrounding us, and bending over us with intense interest, as the spectators did at the Olympian games over those who strove for masteries."* May not the prayers offered by the sainted dead in Hades

* Dr. Harbaugh's *Sainted Dead*, p. 233-9.

account for the conversion of wicked children or friends whom they have left behind? That the saints in heaven supplicate and intercede for those in whom they feel peculiarly interested on earth ought not to be doubted. This is involved in the very nature of the relation of saints to each other in the Church. The strong are to support the weak. Those who have surmounted the dangers and infirmities of the militant state, and are safe on the eternal eminence, must feel themselves constantly moved in interest for their brethren who are still in the valley of conflict below. . . . That the saints in heaven do affectionately remember those whom they have left behind, supplicate and intercede in their behalf, is not a matter to be inferred merely, it is plainly taught in the Scriptures."* And they cried with a loud voice, saying, How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?" (Rev. vi. 10.)

II. We now pass on to consider the relation of Hades to the mediatorial work of Christ. The question here arises, was the work of reconciliation between God and man completed when the Saviour expired upon the cross? Before His descent into Hades Christ had to suffer the penalty of death for mankind. In order that there may be a positive life, there must be a negative death. Christ had to destroy death before He could introduce life into humanity. Are we to understand that expression, "To-day thou shalt be with me in Paradise," to mean that the thief should be with Him that day in heaven? If so, then we will have two ascensions: one while the Lord's body lay in the grave, the other after His resurrection, when He was visibly taken away from His disciples to heaven. To say that Christ meant that Lazarus should that day be with Him in heaven, is to contradict Him when He afterwards said, "Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father." (John xx. 17.) Such a view is contrary to Scripture. Paradise must, therefore, be a place, separate from heaven and hell, where the

* Dr. Harbaugh's *Heavenly Home*, p. 304-5.

disembodied spirits are imprisoned. Here the believers are still under the power of death, and redemption is not complete until they are delivered from its grasp which is only fully done at the resurrection. Though the believers are thus held under the power of death, yet death has been ravished of its sting.

After Christ's sufferings and death upon the cross, we are told that He was buried, and St. Peter tells us that He was "quickened by the Spirit; by which" (Spirit) "also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison." (1 Pet. iii. 18, 19). Those spirits were not in the tomb of Christ. He went to them and into their prison wherever that prison may have been.

"There are no fewer than *five* interpretations of this passage, every one of which has many able advocates. The *first* considers the "spirits in prison" as meaning the happy souls of "Paradise" into which our Lord and the penitent malefactor are supposed to have gone after expiring on the cross. The *second*, as denoting the lost souls in hell to whom Christ preached after His crucifixion. The *third* regards the "spirits in prison" as referring to the Gentiles who were in bondage to Pagan vices, and to whom our Lord preached, not in prison, but by His apostles. The *fourth*, as referring to the antediluvians to whom Christ preached by Noah, while they were in this world, but whose spirits are *now* chained in prison. The *fifth* interpretation is the one maintained by the Romish Church in support of purgatory."* These views, it seems to me, are rather unnatural, and can not satisfy the longing of an earnest and inquiring mind after truth, neither are they an honest explanation of such passages as refer to this subject. We do not propose to consider here the correctness of these views, but pass on and give what we believe the Bible intends to teach on this subject.

Among the different proofs of Christ's descent into Hades, we will only refer to a few. In Eph. iv. 9, we read, "Now that He ascended, what is it but that He first descended into the

* Dr. Bartle, p. 78.

lower parts of the earth." It is generally understood that He ascended into the highest heavens, and occupies the most exalted position in heaven. Are we not also forced to hold that He descended not only to the earth and grave, but also into the lower parts of Hades? Any other explanation of this passage is unnatural and forced. This no doubt teaches that the soul of Christ descended into Hades, while His body was carried into the grave.

Again we read, "For David speaketh concerning him, I foresaw the Lord always before my face; for he is on my right hand, that I should not be moved. Therefore did my heart rejoice, and my tongue was glad; moreover, also, my flesh shall rest in hope. Because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell (Hades), neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption." (Acts ii. 25-27.) "If the soul of *Christ* were not left in hell at His resurrection, then His soul was in hell before His resurrection; but it was not there before His death; therefore, upon or after His death, and before His resurrection, the soul of *Christ* descended into hell; and consequently the CREED doth truly deliver, that *Christ* being crucified, was dead, buried, and descended into hell."*

That Christ both descended into Hades and preached unto the spirits in prison is in the main based on 1 Peter iii. 18, 19, and on chap. iv. 6, to which no other rational explanation can be given. Especially the words, "For this cause was the gospel preached also to them that are dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit." Hermas, one of the Church fathers, taught that not only the soul of Christ, but also His successors on earth, the apostles, preached to the spirits below; that as they followed His steps here, so did they also after their death descend and preach in Hades. If Christ preached to the antediluvians, who were once unbelievers, will not that preaching necessarily have to be continued by others? If not, how can

* Pearson on the Creed, p. 347

we reconcile God's justice and mercy by preaching only to some and not to others? If our interpretation of St. Peter's language is correct, that Christ preached to the dead, He must have "proclaimed to those spirits in the prisons of Hades the beginning of a new epoch, and repentance and faith as the means of entering into the same." We know that the chief burden of the Saviour's preaching on earth was, "The time is fulfilled and the kingdom of God has come nigh, repent and believe the gospel." (Matt. iv. 17; ix. 35.) While His body was held by the bands of death, Christ's spirit carried on the Messianic work. He continued not only to exist in the intermediate state, but to live, and to live employed in the Spirit in which He continued. Who shall place a limit to His power or will while there? Dean Alford concluding his comment on this passage (1 Peter iii. 19) says: "From all then which has been said. . . . I understand these words to say, that our Lord, in His disembodied state, did go to the place of detention of departed spirits, and did there announce His work of redemption, preach salvation in fact, to the disembodied spirits of those who refused to obey the voice of God when the judgment of the flood was hanging over them. . . . It is not purgatory; it is not universal restitution; but it is one which throws blessed light on one of the darkest enigmas of divine justice: the cases where the final doom seems infinitely out of proportion to the lapse which has incurred it." And who will limit the efficacy of this preaching, who shall say that the blessed act was confined to the disobedient in the days of Noah?*

If this view is correct are we not compelled to maintain a *second* probationary state; and to acknowledge that grace extends over into the intermediate state for some at least? Though we speak thus, we do not believe in the doctrine of purgatorial cleansing, neither do we believe in universal restitution.

* Dean Alford's Greek Testament, vol. 4, p. 368.

The primitive Church did not consider it superstitious credulity that the prayers of the righteous, especially when assembled as a Church and sanctified by the celebration of the most sublime mysteries of our faith, might benefit the souls of those who awaited in their separate state the full fruition of their bliss. They pretended to unravel no mystery, nor venture to describe what was the specific advantage which the faithful dead received from this act, yet "the oblations of the faithful in the holy eucharist were made not only for themselves individually, but for the whole Church; and, of consequence, for the dead in Christ; who were held to be a portion of the Church, as certainly as those who were still living in the flesh. They thus kept up in their hearts the memory and affections of the dead, with a pious hope of a reunion with them at the resurrection. And in order to arouse greater interest in this part of the service of the Church they enrolled the names of those for whom offerings and prayers were to be made, and recited them aloud, out of the rolls of the Church. They even refused to pray for such as had been excommunicated, and the sixth general council ordered that the name of Pope Honorius and several bishops be erased from the diptychs.*

It does not follow that Christ descended to Hades to deliver any damned souls, or to translate them from the torments of hell into the joys of heaven. For according to the Bible doctrine it must be written over the threshold of all unbelievers who refused to accept Christ when they had the full opportunity of salvation placed within their reach,

"Lasciate ogni speranza, voi ch'entrate!"

Leave hope behind, ye who enter here. "The fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the second death." (Rev. xxi. 8.) For such there is no

* G. A. Poole's *Life and Times of Cyprian*, pp. 53, 54, 55, 56.

forgiveness "neither in this world, neither in the world to come." (Matt. xxi. 31-2.)

But if there is no grace in the intermediate state for some, we do not see how any hope can be entertained with reference to unbaptized infants, idiots and heathens, unregenerated as they are, who never had the gospel preached to them, and stood in no living union with Christ before their death. To condemn them in a wholesale way would seem to be not only unreasonable, but also unmerciful and unjust, extremely difficult to reconcile with the justice of God, in saving some and letting others go to destruction, without any fault of theirs.

Besides, would not the Christian Church be doomed to an awful punishment for suffering the heathen world to go to perdition, while she boasts of her high prerogative, and Dives-like fares sumptuously every day, the Gentile world, like Lazarus lying at her door full of the putrifying sores of sin, yearning for deliverance, unrecognized and uncared for. After seriously considering this point, let every one who sits at ease in his rich and comfortable position, after showing so little sympathy and self-denial in the cause of Christ and the propagation of His kingdom, beware to exclude heathens and children from the kingdom of heaven, lest he will at the same time, for lack of zeal and effort in behalf of their salvation, exclude himself.

Not only did Christ descend into Hades to preach to the spirits in prison, but according to the Bible the general plan of redemption required and included that His sojourn among those spirits should be a continuation of His sufferings for human transgressions. We say then that the Saviour after expiring upon Calvary entered upon another state of existence, to Him one of suffering. The devil had gained an apparent victory over Christ when He died upon the cross, but the conflict did not end here; the battle was to be renewed in Hades. Christ "passed through a double ordeal, one of which He experienced in this world, and one in the next world. He suffered two deaths, one being His physical death on Calvary, and the other

the spiritual death He endured in Hades. The sufferings of Hades may be considered as the *first death* in the next world, that is, the death that first takes place after the physical death."*

Of these hellish agonies Christ was fully conscious on the cross. For we must not suppose that Christ was alarmed at the prospect of crucifixion, for in that case He would have shown less courage than either of the two thieves that died with Him. They met their lamentable fate with heroic courage. But in the Saviour there was a degree of shrinking and horror absolutely unaccountable, unless we can show that He had to pass through greater suffering after His death on Calvary. Does not this spiritual conflict which awaited Christ in Hades, account for the fear and trembling of His soul in the garden of Gethsemane, when He sweated great drops of blood, and exclaimed, "My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death?" Here He prayed three successive times on His knees, saying, "O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me!" This great agony of soul could not merely have been on account of His sufferings upon the cross, but more particularly on account of His terrible sufferings in Hades, where spiritual death held its sway over the disembodied and departed spirits.

What this mighty conflict was which He here suffered we are not told, neither is it for us to know at present. But the weight of God's wrath rested upon Him which is represented as overwhelmingly severe, and is beyond our comprehension. That He in this conflict was wrestling with the infernal powers, and horrors of eternal death, and was victorious and freed the "spirits in prison," is abundantly proven by His own departure from thence, of which His glorious resurrection is the triumphant evidence.†

* Dr. Bartle on Hades, pp. 130-1.

† As during Christ's entire human history there is an uninterrupted, continually ascending climax of revelations of His glory; so there is parallel and interwoven with that a climax (anti-climax) of woe—the nadir of sorrows—which also is only reached after this life and before His resurrection. His last conflict and deepest tribulation He endures in the intermediate state.

That He in Spirit should go among the disembodied spirits was necessary for Him as Redeemer; and that He should destroy the effects of spiritual death upon the soul was equally necessary; otherwise our souls would have been detained in Hades, in a state of everlasting darkness and misery, leaving our redemption incomplete. "Christ dealt with the living in body, with the spirits in the Spirit." Even to the spirits in prison did He as our surety go, so great was His condescension and so far-reaching the consequences of His voluntary, vicarious sufferings. His triumphant resurrection is the assurance of our complete redemption and resurrection unto eternal life.

That our view is correct, and that it was the gloomy forebodings of the anguish He had to suffer in Hades which distressed His righteous soul, can be clearly seen by examining different passages of Scripture. Does He not refer to this when He says, "I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how am I straitened till it be accomplished?" He manifests the greatest calmness and resignation while hanging upon the cross, praying for His enemies, committing His mother to the affectionate disciple, and promising the penitent thief that he should that day be with Him in Paradise. And yet, after all this exhibition of calmness and composure, He manifests the utmost distress, and cries out in the bitterness of His soul, "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?" These words of agony can have no meaning, nor can any rational explanation be given, as they were uttered about the ninth hour, but a moment before His sufferings were over, and He passed from life into death, unless we admit, that after His death, while His body lay in the grave, He entered not only into Paradise, but into the lowest abode of spiritual beings, and suffered that awful penalty of the damned who are forsaken of God.*

* Dr. Ursinus in his commentary on the Heidelberg Catechism, declares Christ's descent into hell, thus: "It signifies those extreme torments, pains

The Bible frequently and clearly indicates the sufferings of Christ in Hades. In the 116th Psalm we have the remarkable words, "The sorrows of death compassed me, and the *pains of Hades* gat hold upon me; I found trouble and sorrow. Then called I upon the name of the Lord, O Lord, I beseech Thee, deliver my soul." This can not refer to David, but must refer not to Christ's sufferings on earth, but to His agony in the intermediate state. So in Isaiah, if properly translated, we read that our Lord "made His grave with the wicked, and with a rich man in His death." By this "we are to understand that the soul of our Redeemer was *entombed* among the wicked spirits in Hades, which served as a grave or sepulchre for the temporary confinement of His spirit during its disembodied state." By His grave being made with the rich man in his death, is meant that our Lord's dead BODY was to be interred in the ground of a *rich man*.

Of the Prophet Jonah (ii. 1-4) it is said, whose typical character is beyond question or doubt, "Then Jonah prayed unto the Lord his God out of the fish's belly, and said, I cried by reason of mine affliction unto the Lord, and He heard me; out of the belly of Hades cried I, and Thou heardest my voice. For Thou hadst cast me into the deep, in the midst of the seas; and the floods compassed me about; all Thy billows and Thy waves passed over me. Then I said I am cast out of Thy sight: yet I will look again toward Thy holy temple." The whale's belly here can mean nothing but the intermediate state, and as Jonah cried in the belly of Hades or the fish, so Christ cried in Hades.

and anguish which Christ suffered in His soul, such as the damned experience, partly in this, and partly in the life to come." Again, he says, "Christ was to redeem not only our bodies, but also our souls." P. 231. But the author seems to be inconsistent with himself, in admitting Christ's sufferings in the soul, but denies that He suffered those pains in Hades, but on the cross. We can not see how a substitute can, by suffering physical death, be said to suffer the pains of hell, without going there in spirit, as St. Peter says, he did, and suffering those pains in His soul while out of the body.

The three days' darkness in Egypt which preceded the deliverance of the children of Israel from bondage, afforded the Israelites an opportunity to make the necessary preparation for their final departure, but seem also to have shadowed forth the time during which our Saviour would be in Hades. The three hours' darkness at the crucifixion would seem to have been designated to impress upon our minds the same great fact, as well as to indicate the sad and darkened condition of the world without a Saviour.

The apostles clearly intend to teach that the crucifixion of Christ was not the end of those sufferings, which only found their culmination in Hades. This seems to correspond with what we are told in Acts, where it is written: "Ye men of Israel, hear these words: Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you, by miracles, and wonders, and signs which God did by Him in the midst of you, as ye yourselves also know: Him being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken by wicked hands, have crucified and slain: whom God has raised up, having loosened the pains of death: because it was not possible that He should be holden of it." (Acts ii. 22-24.) The pains of dying are suffered while in the body, but the pains of death are suffered out of the body. To loose the pains of death, means to put an end to them. And loosing those pains "implies that Christ was previously suffering them. Hence physical death in this world and spiritual death in the next were the things done to Christ, or the punishment He was compelled to undergo."

In the Psalms we have the expression, "The sorrows of death encompassed me, and the pains of Hades gat hold upon me." God not only delivered Him from the pains of Hades, but He also raised Him from the region of the departed dead. What could this punishment and suffering in the prison of Hades—the place where Christ was for a time—be, but His deprivation of the smiles of His heavenly Father, and being forsaken of God? If Christ had to suffer as substitute for

sinners on earth, how could He loosen their spirits from the pains of death, without suffering those pains of death Himself, as their surety in Hades? The spirit of the Lord, therefore, was not idle while His body lay in the grave, but "departed, as Peter says, and preached to the spirits in prison. Into the abode of unhappy spirits, unto hell, he descended to redeem those out of it, by His word and His Spirit, who would suffer themselves to be redeemed, and would not withstand His grace."*

And Christ not only descended into Hades, but He went into the lowest portion of it, and sojourned and suffered there between His death and the resurrection the inexpressible anguish of His soul. In the Psalms we are told, "For great is Thy mercy toward me, and Thou hast delivered my soul from the lowest Hades." This part to which Christ descended and suffered is the dreadful place of the lost dead; so awful in its misery that the very devils are terrified at the thought of going there, or they would not have prayed the Lord to permit them to pass into the herd of swine. (Luke viii. 31.) If the Son of God trembled, and if the devils were terrified at the thought of going to hell, how will the little sinner feel when he is so unfortunate as to get there? No wonder that some clench their fists and gnash their teeth in agony and despair before they enter there.

The full extent of the Saviour's sufferings are of course incomprehensible to the human mind. So in reference to the lost, we cannot tell in what their sufferings consist, but we know that they are in a condition of eternal separation, or exclusion from God and happiness. They are in torments. But how great this suffering, and how long it shall continue, or whether they will continue for ages in a most horrible state of suffering and in the end be destroyed by total annihilation, from whence they should never be suffered to return to life again, is a ques-

* Sartorius' Person and Work of Christ, p. 73.

tion which eternity alone must answer.* Could a more frightful punishment be supposed than the annihilation of an immortal substance?

The atonement which was afterwards to be effected by the death of the Son of God, was beautifully adumbrated by the sacrifice of goats. Goats were no doubt chosen because they represented wicked men. Here they represented Christ in His sacrificial character, as the substitute for sinners, who was dealt with as a sinner as long as He was under the power of death, and thus represented by the goats, but further they could not typify Him. The goat which was slain, represented the death of Christ on the cross, but the goat on which the lot fell to be the scape-goat was presented alive before the Lord, and Aaron was to lay his hands upon his head, and confess over him all the iniquities, transgressions and sins of the children of Israel, to make *atonement* with him, and let him go into the wilderness. (Lev. xvi. 7-10 and 12). Here we see that two goats were necessary; the one to represent Christ's sufferings and death upon the cross, the other to "represent His sufferings in the abode of Hades. We see that the physical death of the Saviour was only the means or channel for reaching that state in which the great work of the atonement was to be effected," for the expiation of man's guilt. If Christ's sufferings had been finished when He died, the one goat would have been amply sufficient to portray that fact. But two were needed to represent the two sides of His sufferings, the one on earth, the other in the world of spirits. "The putting of all the iniquities of the Israelites upon the head of the live goat by the hands of Aaron, whereby the animal became their substitute, was designed to prefigure the imputation of the sins of the whole world to Christ, and to indicate His substitution for guilty man. After all the sins of the Israelites had been laid upon the scape-goat, it was led away into the wilderness, to a land not inhabited, and this forcibly represents the Messiah laden

* Dr. Witsius, on the Economy of the Covenants, Vol. 1, p. 79.

with the sins of all men going into the miserable regions of Hades, and there suffering the punishment due to guilty man.* Though Christ was absolutely innocent in reality and in the sight of God, yet, being a substitute for sinners, He was necessarily regarded as guilty in the eyes of the law."† He had to suffer the whole penalty for sin. Christ, therefore, "made by His own oblation of Himself once offered, a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world."

"If Christ had merely died a corporeal death, no end would have been accomplished by it; it was requisite, also, that He should feel the severity of the Divine vengeance, in order to appease the wrath of God, and satisfy His justice. Hence it was necessary for Him to contend with the powers of hell and the horror of eternal death. We are also assured that "not only the body of Christ was given as a price of our redemption, but that there was another greater and more excellent ransom, since He suffered in His soul the dreadful torments of a person condemned and irretrievably lost."‡

In this sense Peter says, that *God raised Him up from the dead, having loosed the pains of death; for it was not possible that He should be holden of the pains of death.* (Acts ii. 24).

We must, however, remember that Christ has not changed Hades into Heaven, so that which was formerly Hades, has become by His descent and victory over it, Heaven. Hades is still the place of departed spirits, and has not become the resurrection state, but He has changed it into something like Heaven.

* From some texts of Scripture it would appear that a desert was regarded as the abode of evil spirits, and this would still more strongly represent that part of Hades in which the lost dead are confined. (See Isaiah xlii. 21; Matt. xii. 43; Rev. xviii. 2). And in the Prophet Isaiah (liii. 8) we read: "He was cut off out of the land of the living."

† Dr. Bartle, p. 159, 160.

‡ Calvin's Institutes, Vol. I., p. 464-5.

In reference to the length of time in which Christ suffered in Hades, we believe that it corresponds to the time Adam remained in Paradise. We know that God created on the sixth day, first the cattle, then man, after which Adam named the creatures as they all passed before him, and all had their companions, but Adam had none. Then God laid him in a deep sleep, and made woman from his side. This in connection with the whole history of Creation, seems to indicate that Adam did not sin on the day of his creation. The next day was the Sabbath, on which we can hardly suppose that he was driven out of Paradise, even if he sinned; neither can we believe that Satan would leave him long unmolested in his happiness. Christ seems to have suffered in Hades not only the same length of time, but on the very same days in which Adam was in Paradise. In Gen. iii. 8, we are told, "They heard the voice of the Lord God walking in the garden in the cool of the day:" when Adam and his wife had hidden among the trees of the garden. By this cool of the day is no doubt meant the evening of the day. Probably the Sabbath evening. But before God drove them out of the garden He announced their punishment, and also the hope of reconciliation that they might not despair. So that they were by all probability not driven out of Paradise before Sunday morning, the third day of their creation.

By the doctrine of substitution we do not mean, nor is it necessarily implied that Christ should suffer in His own person every degree of punishment which man was compelled to undergo. He truly suffered the full penalty of the law for man's sin, both on earth physically, and also the pains of hell spiritually, but they were not the same in *kind*; the state of mind was wanting, such as remorse of conscience and the state of despair, as well as the hatred of the damned, and besides His sufferings were not eternal. Adam by a single act of disobedience brought himself and all mankind under the power of physical death in this world, and spiritual death in the next; if nothing had been done, all would have eternally perished. What

Adam did in his own person was virtually done for the race, and what Christ did was not for Himself, but for all mankind. Christ's death was our death, and His resurrection was our resurrection.

Christ is our substitute, but if He suffered only a physical death by crucifixion He is not that substitute, since He has not abolished our physical death. To say that Christ did not die to save us from our *physical*, but only from our spiritual death, then He only saved our soul and not our body, which is equally contrary to the doctrine of the Bible, which assures us also of the resurrection of the body. If He did not suffer in spirit, and men are saved from eternal death, He is not our substitute. We must either give up the idea that the work of atonement was finished by Christ's sufferings on the cross, or abandon the doctrine of substitution altogether, which would leave us in our sins. But we know that "through death *He* destroyed him that had the power of death, that is the devil." (Heb. ii. 14). "We are of opinion," says Dr. Bartle, "that expiation for sin was not made on the cross, neither was it effected in this world, but in that prison reserved for the lost in the next world."

All men, as we stated above, must pass through three stages of existence. The first extends from man's birth to his death, during which time the soul is more or less clogged with disease and mortality. The second state of being commences when the soul is freed from the body, and may be said to be quickened because it is free from matter. The third state of existence is that into which man enters after the soul with the body is reunited, after the latter has put on immortality. Christ alone entered upon this last state of existence, having risen from the dead, never to die any more.

This general statement of facts would seem to be sufficient to establish the point of Christ's sufferings in Hades, and convince us that there our reconciliation with the Father was completed.

It is, however, wrong to suppose that, because Christ our substitute has offered the full penalty for sin, that mankind,

therefore, is now in this general way restored to life and happiness. Both the active and passive obedience of Christ must in some real and living way be imputed to His people. The first Adam, the fountain head from which the whole human race was to flow, transmitted by natural generation, physical and spiritual corruption to his posterity, so the second Adam must not only atone for guilt, but must impute and infuse His Holy nature into His brethren. "The first Adam was a living soul, the last Adam was made a quickening" (*i. e.* life-imparting) "spirit." (1 Cor. xv. 45).

We must not regard the objective grace of Christ as a mere outward mechanical imputation; it must become a subjective appropriation in each individual case. But wherever "the will of the individual opposes itself by unbelief and impenitence against God's blessing, His streams of mercy lose their saving effect." * "The earth, which drinketh in the rain, that cometh oft upon it, and bringeth forth herbs meet for them by whom it is dressed, receiveth blessing from God. But that which beareth thorns and briars is rejected, and is high unto cursing; whose end is to be burned." (Heb. vi. 7-8).

This appropriation of the divine life is the work of the Holy Ghost, and begets regeneration, by which we are born into Christ, and made partakers of all His benefits, and thus become members of His mystical body. For His life is by the Holy Ghost infused into the Church, and through the means of grace made to flow over into His people, who exercise a living faith in the Son of God. We become incorporated with Christ Himself, by eating His flesh and drinking His blood, and because He liveth we shall live also. In His people thus united to their living Head is carried forward His divine life, and thus they are assured of being made partakers of all His benefits. Upon this glorious truth depends the resurrection of all men. Hence St. Paul says, "For since by man came death, by man same also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all

* Wilberforce on Holy Baptism, p. 38.

die, so in Christ shall all be made alive. (1 Cor. xv. 21). "How? By virtue of a new divine element, introduced into our nature by the incarnation, which has already triumphed over mortality in the person of the second Adam Himself, and by which He is now the principle of the resurrection, for the body as well as for the soul, to all that believe on Him to salvation. There is a natural body, and there is a SPIRITUAL body. The first springs from Adam, the second from Christ. As we have borne the image of the one, in our fallen mortal state, so must we also as Christians bear the image of the other. This will be fully reached in the resurrection."* We must ever bear in mind that the second Adam is the channel through which God bestows heavenly blessings,—“The stream of grace must run to us, through the golden pipe of our Saviour’s Humanity.”†

The Christian salvation, then, as thus comprehended in Christ, is not doctrine for the mind to embrace, but a new *Life*, in the deepest sense of the word. When Christ died and rose, humanity died and rose at the same time in His person; as truly, and really, as it had fallen before in the person of Adam. The relation of Christ, the eternal *Logos*, to the race is as truly organic in all its bearings, as that of the first Adam, only in an opposite way. We must not forget, this is the grand underlying principle of the fall, as well as of redemption. We must constantly bear in mind that Adam had not only sundered himself, but the race which was comprehended in himself from all life in God by sin, and utterly disabled humanity to rise again to a higher position by itself. The second Adam, by the hypostatical union of the two natures in His own person, has elevated again not only Himself as He rose from the dead and ascended into heaven, but the race. “That the race might be saved, it was necessary that a work should be wrought not beyond it, but in it; and this inward salvation to be effective must

* Dr. Nevin’s *Mystical Presence*, p. 226.

† Usher’s *Works*, Vol. IV., p. 617.

lay hold of the race itself in its organic, universal character, before it could extend to individuals, since in no other form was it possible for it to cover fully the breadth and depth of the ruin that lay in its way. Such an inward salvation of the race required that it should be joined in a living way with the divine nature itself, as represented by the everlasting Word, or *Logos*, the fountain of all created light and life. The Word accordingly became flesh, that is assumed humanity into union with itself. It was not an act, whose force was intended to stop in the person of one man himself, to be transplanted soon afterwards to heaven. Nor was it intended merely to serve as the necessary basis of the great work of atonement, the power of which might be applied to the world subsequently in the way of outward imputation. It had its use indeed, but not as its first and most comprehensive necessity. The object of the incarnation was to couple the human nature in real union with the *Logos*, as a permanent source of life. It resulted from the presence of sin only, (itself no part of this nature in its original constitution), that the union thus formed called the Saviour to suffer. As the bearer of a fallen humanity, He must descend with it to the lowest depths of sorrow and pain, in order that He might triumph with it again in the power of His own imperishable life. In all this, He acted for Himself, and for the race He represented at the same time. For it was no external relation simply, that He sustained to this last. He was Himself the race. Humanity dwelt in His person as the second Adam, under a higher form than ever it carried in the first."*

As stated above, Hades is divided into two compartments; the one for the just, and the other for the unjust. This will account for Dives and Lazarus seeing each other. The one apartment may be called the upper, and the other the lower Hades. Lazarus was in the upper Hades, the blissful locality of the good; and Dives was in lower Hades, the region of misery. "The wicked," we are told, "shall be turned into

* Dr. Nevin's Mystical Presence, p. 165-6.

Hades, and all the nations that forget God." (Ps. ix. 17). In Hades the spirit or soul only suffers, in hell both body and soul will be punished. The punishment in lower Hades is inflicted before the judgment day; the torments of hell after the judgment day.

Moreover, we are told in Revelation that after the judgment death and Hades will be emptied, and both shall be cast into the lake of fire; this then is called the second spiritual, or everlasting death. (Rev. xx. 13, 14). In Hades will be left all the wicked souls and the devils, while the souls of all the righteous dead, who were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and had not the mark of the beast, will be taken out to reign with Christ on earth a thousand years; this is called the first resurrection, which is confined exclusively to the good. "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection; on such the second death hath no power." (Rev. xx. 3-6).

"The three stages of the righteous may be thus distinguished: In this world *Faith* is the leading feature; in Hades, *Hope*; in Heaven, *Love*; while the condition of the wicked is characterized by *unbelief* on Earth; *Despair* in Hades; and *Hatred* in Hell."

Those who shall dwell for centuries within the prison of Hades will have plenty of time to reflect upon the evil and pernicious influences they have exerted on others while passing through this present world. Their evil seeds, having ripened in others, who will follow them, descending into that gloomy condition, and curse them as their evil advisers and the instigators of their ruin.

The perfect future state of the blessed must be regarded as including the whole man, both body and soul. And this state can only be reached after the general resurrection and judgment. If any of the heathens are saved in the middle state, they must be brought to a knowledge of their sins, and a feeling of their religious wants, so that they will immediately accept

Christ, as soon as He is presented. Heathen children dying in infancy, are no doubt saved by a process of grace in the other world, but for us now in the nature of the case, this must remain a profound mystery.* Grace we say, without doubt, extends over into the intermediate state, or all children and idiots, and heathens will be lost, which is in conflict with the justice and mercy of God.

We cannot comprehend how any one can presuppose that grace will end for the heathens at their death. Should all such noble souls in heathenism, as *Æschylos*, *Pindar*, *Sophocles*, *Socrates*, *Plato*, *Plutarch*, *Seneca*, *Virgil*, *Cicero*, *Burrus*, and many others, who have never heard the Gospel of salvation, be lost? No one but an ignoramus, or an unthinking fanatic, will answer in the affirmative. Do not many of the heathens show more zeal in their religious devotions to their idols, than thousands of Christians show to the true God? "If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin." (*John* xv. 22). Faith comes from preaching, but, "how shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher? And how shall they preach, except they be sent?" (*Rom.* x. 14). Those who could not comprehend the plan of redemption in this life, will undoubtedly have it offered in the spirit-world, which is also clear from Christ's preaching to the spirits in prison. (*1 Pet.* iii. 19, and iv. 6). That all will not accept it, is as certainly true, as it is the case in this life. The Saviour tell us that all sins shall be forgiven, except the sin against the Holy Ghost. The heathens cannot sin against the Holy Ghost, because they do not even know that there is a Holy Ghost. Consequently we conclude that the Gospel will be offered to them in Hades, and they will certainly not all reject it. The Egyptians who would obey God's direction were free from suffering, though they were Egyptians.

We say then for the undecided Heathens and Turks, who

* The children in the Spirit-world will probably be under the instruction of angels and saints, and there learn under the gradual opening of their minds, that holy wisdom which they had no time to acquire on earth.

had no opportunity of knowing the way of everlasting life, and even for such Christians as come under the same rule, there is after death a state of grace, and a possibility of conversion and the forgiveness of sins, but upon the very same condition as here, namely, faith in the Redeemer of the world. In a more general sense, all such fall into the same category, whose faith had commenced before death, but without any fault of theirs, had not been fully mature in its development of love for the full communion of the Lord. All such will have to pass through a process of experience and purification as is necessary for the development of the Christian life in the present world.*

Those who have never come into a living relation with Christ and His Church, Dante, in his poem on heaven, hell, and purgatory, places in a condition of negative punishment, the being deprived of seeing God, the absence of blessedness, and an indefinite longing for it. These we might say have, at least, a glimmer of the light of hope beaming around them.

But whatever scheme we may entertain in reference to God's dealings with unbaptized children and heathens in this middle state, we should never forget that such dealings lie largely, but not entirely, outside of the Bible. But this we know, that if they are saved, grace must extend over into the intermediate state, and that they will be saved by faith in Christ, though as disembodied spirits, in a somewhat different way from that in which we are saved.

Hades will be one day our abode, until that joyous or dreadful hour of the Resurrection morning. Lord, in Thy infinite mercy grant that we may be in the number of those who are now in Abraham's bosom. "Enable us to follow their faith, that we may enter at death into their joy; and so abide with them in rest and peace, till both they and we shall reach our common consummation of redemption and bliss in the glorious resurrection of the last day."

D. F. B.

* See Dr. Schaff's *Sünde Wider den Heiligen Geist*, p. 137, 145, 146. |

ART. IV.—CHRISTIANITY AND OUR CIVIL POLITY.

BY JOHN W. APPLE, A. M.

“For the nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish; yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted.”—ISAIAH lx. 12.

THE state is of God and of man. The former part of the proposition, namely, the state is of God, as thus simply stated, is readily acknowledged and accepted as true, by all those who believe, even in a most general way, in God. Here we meet with scarcely any diversity of opinion, for it is instinctively felt, and unanimously believed, that God is in some way or other in the state. But when we come to ask how God is in the state, the proposition assumes another form, and men's views of it differ as widely as do their conceptions of the Providence of God. One view, the most prevalent, and the most dangerous also, is that which refers the state to God as the creator (beginner) merely of all things visible or invisible, known or unknown. It reasons, that, since man is of God, by a single act of creation, and the state of man, therefore, the state is of God. It holds, that God, “in the beginning,” by a single creative act deposited certain principles in the human breast, which then of themselves have produced the institution which we call the state. It makes God to have deposited in his creations, both natural and moral, some inner law (*lex insita*), which, active of and by itself, now moves on in the accomplishment of his plans and purposes. It isolates God from his works, makes him inactive in them, save in their contemplation, and regards him somewhat as a sower who, in time past having gone forth and having sowed his seeds, now watches them grow, ripen, die, reproduce, and rise, of themselves, it may be, to higher forms, in one continuous process of evolution. Such a view does great

violence to the nature, as well as the plan and unity, of creation, and to the being of God himself. The natural and moral worlds do not subsist apart from God by the constant activity of so called secondary causes or forces lodged in them at their beginning, but they live and move and have their being only as they are continually in God. Their subsistence is but their continued existence, and their continued existence is but their continuous creation. The Supreme Cause here, then, which is God, and nothing less, must of necessity be as constantly active as when the worlds were in the beginning called into being. Such a view, also, does great violence to our religious faith. Instead of believing as we are taught,* that God is continually active in us and we in him, and that he touches our life at every point; we are made to believe that we have been hurled away out of his presence, and that we live, and learn, and grow, and—it must follow—ripen for immortality, by virtue of a self-subsistent activity lodged in our nature. In this view, also, prayer were a mere empty mockery. It were merely something subjective: it would have no effect except that which the subject might produce on himself; as, for instance, the proud spirit might be curbed, by humiliating itself in the attitude of prayer. There would be no room here to take in the objective power of grace, and man were his own guide and his own God. These secondary causes or forces, self-subsistent activities in mind and matter,—what are they but so many terms of compromise with the unbeliever and the infidel? Let them have my firm belief, and nature becomes my God, and I have a far more contemptible, and far less efficacious religion, than was the polytheism of ancient Greece or Rome. Take the force that drives the sun athwart the heavens, that moulds the crystal, that rears the oak, that binds the eagle as by chains of iron to its nest on the rugged cliff, that causes men to rise up in judg-

* Acts xvii. 28, Matt. vi. 30, Ps. lxxxvii. 7, Rom. xi. 36, indeed almost every page in the Bible.

ment against wrong, to organize society, to build cities, to enact laws, to found states,—take these forces and make them active of themselves, while their creator sits in some lofty tower in the heavens in the enjoyment of a sweet sabbatic rest, and you erect an Olympus of impersonal forces, you resolve creation into a mechanized automaton, and these forces become the true objects of your worship, if indeed you have any worship at all. Sometimes, we are told that this is a mere battling of words, a warfare of terms. What difference does it make, we are asked, whether you call these activities God, or nature, or secondary causes? Will not the real nature and the course of things remain the same under either theory? But our ideas of nature, God, and man, so far as we entertain any, have more to do with our common every-day life than we often imagine. The practical deductions for our religious and civil life will be vastly different, according as we believe our being to be actuated directly by the great First Cause, or by merely natural causes,—causes acting of themselves according to the prescript of some primitive commandment of God. If we believe, for instance, that natural causes, as generally understood, are sufficient to explain everything in nature and history without any intervention of God, then there is an end to the Providence of God, and politics, legislation, education, and the whole social world must be constructed without any reference at all to God; and any one can easily imagine what a sad wreck of the whole moral order such godless principles would in a short time produce. But this theory of natural causes can never be sufficiently substantiated to cause any fear of its ultimate triumph over the Christian theory, according to which God himself is directly and continually present and active in his creation. In the language of another,* “Thank God nothing of this” (theory of natural causes) “is proved, and every word of it is false. Nature is not explicable without the intervention of God. His-

* Rev. Aug. J. Thebaud, S. J. *The Church and the State, Catholic Quarterly Review*, July number.

tory supposes at its very beginning a Supreme Ruler, whose interposition is visible throughout its whole course. Politics are not left to the vagaries of man, but power comes from God in spite of popular theories. A tyrant is not allowed to do his worst without the fear of a supreme avenger of wrong. Man is not a machine, nor human society a herd of animals. Who dares say that everything is naturally explained, when everything in fact is still a mystery? The more the supernatural is attempted to be expelled, the more the sphere of mystery increases. For the admission of the supernatural is often the only way to reach an intelligible account of the most simple workings in the soul of man, as well as in the external world. Let any scientist tell us how the words of Ovid have always been considered as sublimely truthful: *Video meliora proboque; deteriora sequor*. After this, thousands of questions of the same kind offer themselves for solution without greater probability of success." Natural forces, as they are called, if they are to stand at all, can do so only as they are regarded as so many names of the different activities of the Supreme Being himself. They are the words of the Almighty streaming forth constantly from his person, and supplying the universe with life and activity. It is God's voice we hear in the storm; his being that moves in the mighty waters, that rides in the air with the winds, and stirs in the earthquake; his beauty we see in the sunset; his power and his goodness crushing the wrong and asserting the right. It is God that acts in the grand law of gravitation, balancing the worlds in their solitary paths through the heavens; and that prompts every act of love, of mercy, and of justice amongst men. The state is of God, then, not in the sense that he made man at his birth able of himself to organize and to support it; but in the sense that he constantly supplies the material, the forces, the ideas, which give it substantial life. Justice, law, right, truth, love,—whence are they but from the bosom of the Almighty?

But the state is also of man. It is of him in its external

form and constitution. Through him the moral law, issuing forth from the divine will, runs its course in the form of the state. It is of him in that he is the architect who moulds and fashions it out of the supply of ethical ideas which are always at hand for his use through the ever constant activity of the Almighty.

In this view, the state becomes a projection of the moral law, through the agency of man, in the sphere of time and sense. It is no longer a mere device or contrivance of man's own making, grounded in the fears and wants of his nature. It was more than this even in heathenism. Minos, king of Crete, we are told, received his laws from Jupiter; Lycurgus is said to have derived his state-craft from Apollo; and the good Numa was thought to have derived laws for his people from the nymph Egeria. The sentiment was by no means uncommon amongst them, that

“—by the ruling powers of heaven
All virtues are to mortals given,
Wisdom is theirs, from them are sprung
The active hand, the fluent tongue.”

Indeed in heathenism almost everywhere, there is found such a sense of some supreme being's continual presence and power in the affairs of men, as to exclude all theories, like the social compact for example, which would make the state the creature of mere human wisdom or human ingenuity. So also, the best thinkers of the world, ancient or modern, Christian or profane, everywhere write of the great ideas which nourish the state as constant emanations of a divine mind; and with one voice proclaim him who considers man able of himself to originate righteousness, law, or truth * as insane as Salmoneus of old, who with his brazen car and horn-hoofed steeds, dared to imitate the storms and the inimitable thunder of Jupiter himself. No, man may appropriate the good, he may apprehend truth, he may interpret law, he may develop and consecrate

* Dr. John W. Nevin, July number of *Mercersburg Review*, page 346.

rights; but he never has created and never can create them. And until this conclusion of the ages remains disproved, we are bound to believe that the state is of man, not through any "dead self-action or self-intelligence" on his part; but of him in that he opens his spirit to an influx of those invisible, spiritual forces which come to him from beyond himself, and translates, from the being of God to his own moral life, order, righteousness, and law, in the form and constitution of the state. We know that it is often urged in opposition to this view that man thus becomes a mere tool, and loses his dignity and majesty as a being made in the image and likeness of a God. What! is a man less a man because, forsooth, he does not manufacture the air which he breathes, and which supports his life? We think it adds to his majesty and power, rather than detracts from it, that he is able to appropriate, and live on the most perfect being of his God.

In this view, then, it is evident that the state can only meet its ends in the degree that its members are able to lay hold on, and appropriate, the being and the will of God; just as the body can only meet its ends as it is able to appropriate the elements, as light, food, air, &c., from which it derives its nourishment and support.

How now is this possible? how is this conformation of the human with the divine will to be reached? Can it be effected by pushing out the powers of the intellect by education or culture to their utmost limit? No: men act as they love, not as they think; the best of intellects may become slave to the worst of wills; the will is interior to, and deeper than, the understanding; and, hence, the perverted will needs more than a right intellect to draw it to its true orbit. And so any effort on the part of man alone to reach the end must fail, and be met, like another Babel presuming to pierce the skies, only with confusion of face. The heavens must be bowed down; there is need of a mount Sinai, of a Kingdom of God, on earth to effect it. It is through the Christian religion alone

that the will of the state can ever make any true and lasting progress toward being conformed to the will of God.

This is not only the voice of all true philosophy, but it is also the verdict of all past history. Christianity came like manna from heaven to a perishing world, and the revolutions which it has effected in the state are as conspicuous as they are mighty. Compared to the light it furnishes to the state, the sublime moral maxims of Oriental nations, the most glorious polity cultured Athens ever had, the grand system of jurisprudence which Rome gave to the world as a perpetual memorial of her greatness and glory, grow dim and cease to blaze forth as lights for the nations. It has developed and sanctified the absolute rights of the individual to a degree which otherwise could never have been attained. It has purified and softened domestic and social relations. It has instituted a law of love and of conscience as a rule of civil conduct over against the rigid observance of the mere letter of the law. It has abolished slavery, and proclaimed instead the sublime doctrine of moral equality amongst men. It has established a public peace and tranquillity before unknown by holding continually before the human vision a destiny beyond the horizon of the present life. It has laid low the barriers between races, and given rise to a universal brotherhood of nations and a world-wide philanthropy. Trojan and Tyrian now indeed live side by side, and are treated with no discrimination. Thrones red with blood, which once ruled the world, have disappeared, and others all white, proclaiming in loud tones, "Peace on earth," have risen, instead, over Christian nations. Christianity, in short, has opened the hearts of men to an infusion of virtue from God, which has sublimed their natures, their laws, their governments, their states.

What now has been said, in this broad and general view, of the state and its relation to Christianity, both in its idea and manifestation, applies, in no less degree, to our own civil polity as a particular form of the state. But the relation which holds

between Christianity and our civil polity is of a special and particular character. The peculiar nature of our government calls for Christianity as the *sine qua non* of her existence. Look at our Civil Polity: Here no crowned head dares say, like Louis XIV. of France, "I am the state," (*l'état c'est moi*). No select few arbitrarily fashion the laws and the life of the nation. It is the people who are the main spring in the stupendous machinery of our government. The people, and they exclusively, are the source and original of all power in the affairs of state. "It is the people's constitution, the people's government; made for the people, made by the people and answerable to the people." Our rulers are but the exponents of the public will and sentiment; they are but the representatives of the people, and not their lords and masters. The springs of our national life do not flow forth from a fixed common central source, as from an inherited monopoly founded on the doctrine of divine right, and then flow outward to the various parts of the republic; but they issue forth first from innumerable sources outside the center, and, bearing with them the various elements of the country, flow inward, and having united in a great central reservoir, as it were, to form a resultant element, the representative of them all, they then flow forth to all parts of the nation, and give strength and life to a union, which has not yet ceased to be a wonder to the world, and which is certainly one of the grandest achievements of modern times. Here then we have a polity originated and upheld continually by the people: *a polity whose virtue depends upon the personal virtues of its people*. Let the people's virtue therefore be lost, let the public morals and the public conscience become corrupt, and no particular administration, though robed in the purity of heaven itself, and armed with the inflexible rigor of gods could save us in the end from political ruin. Where, then, are we to look for this individual virtue, this virtue for the masses, this virtue upon which depends the stability and integrity of our polity but to the Christian religion? If to no other source (and from

what other source can virtue flow from God to man to the extent demanded here?) it can be seen at once what a palladium Christianity becomes of our civil polity; what a palladium of our civil and religious liberty; what a palladium of our domestic peace and social happiness; what a palladium of all those heaven-born rights which we enjoy as citizens of this broad and glorious republic.

This truth was, indeed, instinctive in the minds of the founders of our civil polity at its birth, and it has been uppermost in the minds of its chief and most successful supports ever since.

It needs but a mere glance at our civil polity—at its fundamental principles, and at its history beginning far back in our colonial life, and running down to the present time—to see that Christianity has been not only its informing spirit from its very birth, but also its main strength and stay through its entire existence. Take, for example, that grand doctrine which was wrung forth from our people as they stood trembling on the verge of a bloody and perilous resistance to their parent country, that doctrine which forms the key-note to the Declaration of Independence, and underlies our most excellent laws respecting the distribution, the transmission, and the alienation of property, our system of representation, and of free schools, and, indeed, our whole civil polity—take this doctrine, as we have it stated in the Declaration of Independence, “That all men are created equal; that they are endowed with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness,” and view it in the light of philosophy and history, and you will be bound by incontrovertible proofs to confess it to be the outcome of a Christian heart, a Christian mind, a Christian people, even though some of the leading actors in the scene were not individually under its power. Yes, it was Christianity that hovered over our civil polity at its birth, and like an angel of light, conveyed to it life and strength from the Throne of thrones, and the King of kings;

that guarded it in its tender infancy ; that went before it as a pillar of fire in the dark and gloomy night of revolution ; that rescued it from a suicidal death in the gloom and despair of a bloody rebellion ; that threw its arms of protection around it when party spirit ran high, and political animosity threatened it with a deluge of fraternal blood ; that gives it power to-day to hold together in a union, by their voluntary consent, over forty millions of people, scattered, as they are, throughout the length and breadth of this vast country.

But if Christianity be indispensable to the existence of our nation, in a general way, first, for the reason that the State in its very idea presupposes the existence and the assistance of the Christian religion in order to its true and proper development ; and if it be so, second, for the reason that our Government rests on the personal virtues of the people ; *a fortiori*, it will be found to be particularly so at the present time, third, because of the moral and the intellectual condition of the great mass of our citizens. Christianity, whether because the Church has been slumbering, or because the new, modern (skeptical) ideas of God, man, Church, State, salvation, religion, etc., have been so generally accepted by our people, or whether because we are reaping the first (corrupt) fruits of the war, or whether because of a combination of these and other causes, has less hold on our people generally now than at any time, perhaps, of our previous national existence. And in the degree that this is so we find corruption in all places, both high and low. In the South, we are told, the great mass of citizens, particularly the emancipated slaves, do not know the wrong of selling their votes, as it were, by auction. In the North while our citizens know the wrong, they do not fear its commission. Corporations, regarding their own interests paramount to those of the country, do not scruple to rob (if not literally, virtually) their employees of the most sacred and the most precious right their country bestows upon them, namely, the right to vote according to their own free choice and opinion.

The employee often holds his position under the ignominious tenure of exercising his right of suffrage according to the will and dictation of the employer. The wisest and best business man is he who can steal the most without discovery. In business generally there is mistrust and suspicion. The old-style confidence and honesty has been lost. "The honest man is considered one with the ignorant and stupid." In the common walks of life honesty and strict integrity are far below par. As a result of this, also, in the high chairs of the nation there is unprecedented fraud and corruption. What now is the only effective cure for this corruption? what is the only rescue for the nation from this downward course? Find it if you can outside of Christianity. Education and Christianity must be disseminated amongst the masses. Men must know how to live wisely and honestly. The individual voter, it is true, must needs have an education to give him a judgment worthy of a free citizen; but he must also have moral stamina to serve as a light-house for that judgment to conduct it safely past the shoals of bribery, and of undue personal influence to a free and untrammelled vote. When Christianity had a hold on the people, and men were honest in their words and deeds, our Government was pure, and unsullied by the corruption of these later years. In the degree, however, that ignorance, dishonesty and unbelief have characterized our voters, our Government has become corrupt and impure, and the only way to save it now from utter ruin, and to make it more than an experiment simply, is unquestionably through the aid and influence of the Christian religion. And as we said before this can be accomplished only by disseminating Christianity amongst the masses. For, however far a pure administration may go toward reforming the nation, unless you destroy the evil and corruption down in the people we have no lasting surety for our safety. You may lop off the poisonous head of the hydra as often as you please; but so long as the evil principle is active in the veins and arteries, another head will rise up and

take the place of the one you have destroyed. What a work here for the preacher, the lawyer, the Christian !

We have seen, or tried to see at least, that the State is of God in that he supplies *constantly* the ideas which constitute its animating soul ; that it is of man in that as these ideas become actualized in his life he gives it a constitution and a form ; that Christianity, whatever its highest and most important mission may be, becomes a medium through which these ideas, as they flow forth from the will of God, are made more and more to be the essence of the will of the State ; that Christianity is, and has been, in this general way, of great value to our polity as a particular form of the State ; that our Government, depending, as it does, on the personal virtues of its people, demands Christianity as the indispensable condition of its strength and stability ; that it is clearly deducible from the fundamental principles of our civil polity, and from its history, that Christianity moulded it at its birth, and has been its main preservation ever since ; and that, to-day, owing to the intellectual and moral condition of the great mass of our citizens, our only safety, as a nation, is to be found at the hands of the Christian religion.

At this point, now, we are met with the old question of the relation between Church and State ; and here we are told that that question has long since been decided, and that no practical advantage is to be gained now from its consideration. But the question of the union of Church and State has not yet been decided, nor is it likely to be for years to come. We grant that history has given its reproof, in war and blood, to the false attempts which have been made toward its solution in times past ; that it has stamped its irrevocable veto on any such union as was attempted in the time of Gregory VII. or Henry VIII. of England : but does this decide the question ? Is it a solution to the question to say that since every plan of union that has yet been attempted has partially failed, therefore, the two must stand independent of

each other? Such a conclusion becomes a mere begging of the question. It is a conclusion somewhat like the one which the young mathematician often reaches, when, after several failures to reach the proper results in his calculations, he triumphantly concludes there must be a fallacy somewhere in the statement of the problem. Instead of being a problem solved it is one that is now agitating the mighty minds of Europe, from Great Britain to the Bosphorus: one that is gradually finding its way into the political centers in our own country. In the university Christian ethics is grappling hard with heathen ethics; and, indeed, the world over, in education, and in almost every department of life, the question comes up in some form or other, and is as live to-day as it was centuries ago.

According to the view which we have taken of the origin of the State, and of the source of its unfolding life, and of its consequent dependence on Christianity, the right relation between Church and State is to be found, not in their absolute separation, but in their union—in their union both in internal life and external constitution. The theory of a free Church and a free State, as often stated, will not, can not, satisfy the demands of the case.

Just here we are aware we meet with opposition even among Christians. We are told that this position will not hold as a conclusion of our foregoing argument. It may be conceded that the Church is as much of a helpmeet, even necessity, for the State as we have claimed it to be, yet it will not be granted that their marriage or union follows therefrom as a strict logical conclusion. The Church can do all we have claimed for it in a free way, we are told, without being recognized by the State.

Well, we will not claim for our position, then, that it is a strict conclusion following necessarily from a stated premise. We will claim for it merely that it is an inference following most naturally from the preceding positions on the State and Christianity.

More than this we could not desire since the question is as yet involved in so much confusion and debate. As an inference, then, our position is, that, if the State is to accomplish well its mission, it must be united with the Christian Church both in internal life and external constitution. But it may be said this inference clashes with the generally accepted ideas of the ends and the province of the State.

The State, it is said, has nothing to do with the propagation of religious truth. Its ends are only earthly and temporal, as the protection of persons and property. We are told that, if the State can accept the moral teaching of Christianity, it can do so only from a utilitarian standpoint—on account of the safety of its citizens. The State may for instance enjoin the observance of monogamy upon its citizens, but only because such a course is deemed necessary for the protection of its citizens, and particularly for the protection of its women. So, it may adopt the divorce laws taught by the New Testament, but it can do so only on the grounds of utility, that is, it must show that these laws are necessary for the welfare of the State, for the protection of woman, and for the rights of children. So with the observance of Sunday, we are told its observance is enforced because in the sanitarian's view our citizens require one day out of every seven for rest. The teachings of the Bible, in short, are regarded as so many wise suggestions, which are to be tried in the balance of human wisdom, and, if found useful to society and civil order, accepted by the State.

But we believe the State has to do with religion, and the propagation of religious truth; and that too not merely on the ground of utility. We believe also that while Government may primarily be concerned with earthly and temporal ends, it also has to do with moral and spiritual purposes. Man's soul and body are too conjunct to be cared for separately—the one here and the other there, the one now and the other then. Education, we are aware, is considered its own proof; and, for its own

sake and not for the sake of utility, is counted due from the State to its citizens.

Christianity, also, we take it, authenticates itself as a revelation of God, and should on this ground be accepted by, and united to, the State.

But we may state here, as we show hereafter, that, while we believe the State should unite with the Church, and should accept the Christian religion as its law, and should teach the Christian faith and ethics to its citizens, it should do so not with violence, but only in the degree that the people are prepared for such a course.

Exactly what the nature of this union is to be is another question and one with which we are not here chiefly concerned. If government ever was, or ever could be, a full-grown Minerva sprung from the head of human wisdom, if States ever could be built up on theories of the intellect, there would be great gain in solving theoretically the union between Church and State. As it is, however, for all practical purposes, it is sufficient to know, and to keep in view, the fact that in their union only is to be found their true and right relation. Keeping this steadily in view, then, history, and not speculation, or any *a priori* reasoning, will determine the nature and extent of this union so far as it concerns this present life. And just this is what we conceive to be the peculiar, as well as the grandest, mission of these United States—to work out, and determine, historically the proper union between Church and State. The chief point here then is, that our Government recognize the fact that there must be a union between the Christian Church and her civil polity, and that it endeavor to direct its life toward this end as far as possible in its historical development.

But, though we can not foresee exactly what the nature of this union is to be, history and reason, and Christianity itself, tell us, even in characters of blood, what it can *not* be, and give us light in reference to it, which we will do well, indeed, not to disregard.

No union between the Church and our civil polity can ever stand, which will subordinate slavishly and mechanically the one to the other.

The union can not be one that will cause the Church and the State to lose their distinctive characters. The State is an end in itself, and exists for itself, and so with the Church; and each must preserve its identity and distinctive character whatever be the nature of their union.

The union must take place, not outwardly and arbitrarily, but inwardly and voluntarily. The inward union must precede the outward: the consent of the people must precede outward legislation.

This then determines the line of conduct for our Government. Its efforts must look first to an internal and voluntary union. It is to encourage a union of life and sentiment. It is not to enforce virtue or Christianity by legislation; but its laws are to be imbued with the spirit of the Christian religion. From the same religion it must borrow its standard of right and justice. It is not only to acknowledge publicly and officially that God is its Governor and his law its authoritative rule of action; but that Christianity is the only way of righteousness and life for the nation. We want no "corporation" or "test acts" mechanically and arbitrarily hung over the heads of the people, as we see it in English laws, to force the people into the ways of an established Church; but we do want something equivalent for us planted in the hearts of our citizens. This internal union has indeed begun. We are known the world over as a Christian nation; and why? Is it because Christianity is the popular religion of the country; is it because our people are a church-going people; because of the many church buildings which rear their majestic steeples toward high heaven in country and in town? We think rather because our laws are Christian laws; because our civil and political institutions are Christian institutions; because, as has been held by some of the highest courts in this State and in others, Christianity is

a part of the common law of the land. We can scarcely touch one fundamental principle of our civil polity without being made sensible of this internal union; without seeing how the Church life and the State life here flow into and interpenetrate each other. Take the laws respecting marriage in the Church and State and you at once have a bond of union. Take the oath in our courts of justice, and what would be its security for property, for reputation, for life, if robbed of the religious obligation which Christianity gives it?

But this internal union already begun deep down in the invisible springs of our national life, must gradually become outward and external. Some element will rise up in opposition to the Christian character of our State or national institutions, and necessitate judgment, or action of some kind, on the part of our Government. These opposing elements are already heard rumbling in the life centers of our country, and clearly indicate the heavy storms which are ahead of us as a nation. A large part of the foreign-born population, for instance, united with an unchristian element, of our country, are urging vigorously that, as there is an entire separation here of Church and State, it is contrary to the genius of our institutions to enforce the observance of the Sabbath by the civil law. So, also, polygamy and free-love rear their viperous heads with impunity in opposition to the right of the law to sanction and to defend those institutions for the family, purely Christian in character, as monogamy for instance, which have become dearer to our people than their lives, and which have given security to our home life and made it radiant with the Christian virtues—purity, peace, holiness, love. Here, then, we arrive at a position where the course of our Government becomes clearer and more tangible than before. Its duty is now no longer merely to foster and encourage Christianity among all its citizens and subjects by example, by the spirit of its laws, by moral suasion; but it is confronted with a given case upon which it must pass judgment in the way of legislation.

From what standpoint, now, is our Government to act; what premise is to govern and direct its legislation? And just here we are aware we tread on disputed ground. One premise of action is, no matter what may be the sentiment of the people, the law in its external expression, from whatever source it may derive its spirit, must not, dare not, know or recognize any religion as such above the other religions of the world. The law must be neutral, and be acceptable to Jew, Turk, Infidel and Christian alike, the one as the other. It must be shaped in its external form at least with reference to a Christian people to-day, so as to suit a Jewish or Mohammedan America fifty or a hundred years hence. This premise is in perfect accord with the theory, which we have already noticed; which holds that there should be no union between Church and State.

We are told by those who advocate this premise that such is the spirit of our constitution; which says, "Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of a religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." But the establishment of a religion outwardly and arbitrarily by force of law (and what but this can the constitution here mean unless it be inconsistent with the theory that the will of the people shall be the law of the land?) is a very different thing from recognizing a religion by law so far as it has already been established by moral means in the life and in the customs of the people. The words of Judge Story may not be inapplicable in this connection when he says, "It is impossible for those who believe in the truth of Christianity as a divine revelation, to doubt that it is the especial duty of Government to foster and encourage it among all the citizens and subjects. This is a point wholly distinct from that of the right of private judgment in matters of religion, and of freedom of public worship, according to the dictates of one's conscience."*

What now is the premise of action which we would suggest for our Government, holding, as we do, to a union between Church and State? It is this:

* Exposition of Constitution, page 260.

Our Government is not bound to hold itself independent of, and separate from, the Christian religion. It is not to occupy a neutral ground in its legislation in respect to cases which arise between Christianity and other systems of religion or infidelity. And here let us hear Judge Story again: "The right of a society or government to interfere in matters of religion will hardly be contested by any persons who believe that piety, religion and morality are intimately connected with the well being of the State, and indispensable to the administration of justice."* It has a right to recognize Christianity by law in a degree commensurate with its free establishment in the institutions and the customs of the people; which point, we think, could easily be maintained on the recognition which our Government gives to the will of the people. It has a right, nay, it is its duty rather, to defend the Christian institutions of the land from the attacks of the infidel and the non-Christian, and that, too, as we have before stated, not only because they are conducive to the good and welfare of civil order; but first, and mainly, and chiefly, because they are Christian institutions rooted and grounded in the life of a Christian people. This premise, in our view, marks out the only true, at least the only safe, course for our nation.

Let it, therefore, be adopted by the nation rather than that other premise which we have noticed, and which has been stealing like a subtle poison into the veins and arteries of our nation. Let it be stamped in bold characters on the front of our legislative halls. Let it burn as an eternal watch-fire in the minds of our rulers and our people, far beyond the billows of conflicting opinions, and safe from the storms of debate.

Then we have a security everlasting, for our country—its Christian laws and its Christian institutions—from a host of godless political demagogues, of infidel and immoral subjects, who would impiously rob it of its altars, its household gods,

* Commentaries on the Constitution, volume iii. page 722.

may, even of its very life's blood. Then we may look for the marriage bells, golden bells, to ring out in this *our* land, *our* country, *our* nation the true nuptial union between Church and State. Then the stains which now disgrace our political records will be blotted out ; and vice, with all the thrones which she has erected in civil life since the State was, will fall down before the advent of virtue and honesty in their fullness among men. Then the State prodigal will find its true home where life and nourishment will flow to it in unbroken streams from the King of kings, and from the Lord of lords. Then, indeed, wars having ceased, the harsh ages shall grow mild ; and the State shall

“ See golden days, fruitful of golden deeds,
With joy and love triumphing, and fair truth.”

Pursuing the other course, as indeed it may, its end like that of nations going before in the march of decline and decay, will be that described by Albion's reckless bard—

“ There is a moral of all human tales ;
’Tis but the same rehearsal of the past,
First Freedom, and then Glory—when that fails
Wealth, vice, corruption,—barbarism at last.”

ART. V.—THE ESCHATOLOGY OF MODERN SPIRITUALISM.

BY REV. JOS. HENRY DUBES.

It is now nearly twenty-eight years since the movement known as Modern Spiritualism originated at Rochester, in the State of New York. Its beginnings were sufficiently humble, not to say contemptible. "It originated," says William Howitt, "in the ordinary visit of what the Germans had denominated a *Polter-Geist*, or knocking-ghost; but either the temperament of the North American public was more favorable to its rapid development, or the time had come in the more general scheme of Providence for a more full and decided prevalence of spiritual action; for it spread with almost lightning rapidity, assumed new and startling forms, and rapidly established itself into a great and significant fact in the minds of more than five millions of people of all classes, professions, and persuasions."

With the so-called "phenomena" of spiritualism we have on this occasion nothing to do, nor are we called upon to decide upon its merits as a pretended supernatural revelation. No doubt the vast majority of these "manifestations" are mere tricks, and, indeed, spiritualist writers are not wanting who speak with the utmost contempt of everything of the kind. "So long," says Andrew Jackson Davis, "as men care to be deceived by tricks of *legerdemain*, whether performed by spirits in the body, or outside of the body, they will certainly be deceived in ninety cases out of a hundred."

Whatever may be the character of Spiritualism, the fact remains, that it is one of the most remarkable signs of the times. It has its prominent advocates in all classes of society in Europe and America, and no less than fifty periodicals are said

to be published in its interest. Among its outspoken advocates have been mentioned, without contradiction, such names as those of Profs. Hare, Mapes, and Bush; Hiram Powers the sculptor; Whittier, the poet; Phœbe and Alice Cary; Sir Roderick Murchison, the geographer; William and Mary Howitt; Prof. De Morgan, the distinguished mathematician; Prof. Crookes, the leading chemist of Great Britain; Alfred R. Wallace, who shares with Darwin the honor of having originated the theory of evolution by natural selection as the origin of species; Baron Reichenbach, Ruskin, Tennyson, and many others.

A system which in the quarter of a century has gained such a multitude of eminent adherents, cannot be ignored or magisterially ruled out of existence. Personally, we have neither seen nor read anything which would incline us to acknowledge its pretensions; but are rather inclined to regard it as a delusion, based, perhaps, on certain imperfectly known laws of nature, and rendered possible as a rebound of the pendulum from the cold and heartless skepticism which characterizes the scientific thinking of our age. Its one great truth is borrowed from the Church—it is the reality of spiritual communion; which, however, can only be normally enjoyed in the Communion of Saints.

All this has, however, but little to do with the questions at issue. The subject has become sufficiently important to demand attention, and it must not be said of us (as Spiritualists are fond of saying) that we are, "like the Gadarenes, in so far that instead of investigating the supernatural, we desire it to depart out of our coasts; or, like the astronomical professor at Padua who, after denying the discoveries of Kepler, refused to look through a telescope, for fear he might be compelled to renounce his cherished opinions."

In studying such a subject as this—which is fast becoming a system of doctrine—justice demands that we should confine ourselves to the utterances of its most eminent exponents. We are told by spiritualists that it is much easier to hold commu-

nication with wicked earth-bound spirits, than with those who move in higher spheres; and that wicked mediums often attract lying spirits, who not only confirm them in their erroneous opinions, but often take an insane pleasure in leading on their victims to utter ruin. "To condemn Spiritualism," says Crowell, "because a few like these, through their grossness and ignorance attract evil influences, is as irrational as to condemn preaching because some preachers degrade it, and some hearers pervert it." "Spiritualism," says Epes Sargent, "is no more responsible for nominal spiritualists than Christianity is for nominal Christians, among which may be counted Free-love Anabaptists, Mormons, and the brigands of Italy."

As we have no desire to treat any one unfairly, we propose to limit ourselves, on this occasion, to certain assertions concerning the nature of the world to come, found in the writings of so-called Christian spiritualists, by whom we understand those spiritualists who claim—we think unjustly—that their system is identical with primitive Christianity; and who proclaim their belief in the Bible as a correct record of a supernatural revelation of which modern spiritualism is a necessary and natural continuation.

In our remarks concerning the Eschatology of Spiritualism, we confine ourselves to what is generally regarded as the first part of the subject—the spirit-world and the condition of its inhabitants, as described by spiritualists. "It is remarkable," says Rev. Chas. Beecher, "that though spiritualists differ widely on almost every conceivable point of Theology and Philosophy, their views of the nature of the spirit-world are essentially the same, whether uttered in America, Europe, or Australia."

Of course, in a paper like the present, we cannot hope to do more than offer a few notes on several books which we have recently been induced by curiosity to read, and whose statements we generally present without note or comment.

Spiritualism claims to differ from former pretended revela-

tions by more fully developing the subject, and thus rendering many things clear which before were indistinct and doubtful. St. Francis, Stilling, Boehme, Swedenborg, and others, it is said, had glimpses of the spirit world; but they were like voyagers who touch at different points of an unknown continent; they saw but little, and their views were greatly influenced by their preconceived notions. Now the great multitude of spiritual visitors have enabled us to get a more consistent idea of that higher creation, and if not to describe it accurately, at least to map a portion of its outlines with tolerable exactness.

Spiritualists agree that the world to come has a real, substantial, and in a certain sense a material existence. Christians generally would, perhaps, be ready to accept this statement, but as uttered by spiritualists, it has a meaning of its own; and though some writers are careful to say that the spiritual world is not "material," it is plain that they merely mean to say that it consists of a purer and more refined form of matter than that of which this world is composed. It must be remembered that nearly all the advocates of modern spiritualism assume to be scientists, and according to the mode of thinking in which they have been trained, can conceive of no form of existence which is not purely material. Hence they regard the spiritual as a legitimate subject for scientific experiment and inquiry, and seek above all things to establish its material existence. Let the following extract from Crowell's "Primitive Christianity and Modern Spiritualism," suffice as a specimen of their apologetics:

"Oxygen, nitrogen, carbon, and hydrogen, are the principal elements in all matter. They are gases and invisible, yet when combined and organized they become visible and apparent to all the senses, and why should there not be still more ethereal elements—gases if you please—which in like manner combine to constitute a sublimated spiritual world; a world to which our natural senses are not fitted nor intended to discern, nor appreciate? Is not this possible? And if an All-wise

Being has created all that exists, is it not probable? and does not the greatest difficulty in the way of believing that it is so arise from a pre-existing, and perhaps a dominant doubt of the existence of this great intelligence? for if His existence is fully admitted, we cannot deny that He could create such a world as easily as this, and the only question to be settled would be the one of its adaptability to our spiritual necessities and desires."

In full accordance with this view, the mystery of death is declared to be "a change of externals, by which the real man is instantaneously removed to a higher plane." Spiritualists are fond of calling it "a mere chemical change." "The change is as natural," they say, "as passing into sleep, and the awakening from slumber. Death is but entering upon a true and free existence, an enlargement of the field where all the spiritual faculties can find room and scope for their exercise."

There is therefore ordinarily no suspension of consciousness in death. The individual may be unconscious at the moment of dissolution, in consequence of previous disease, but with death he suddenly awakes in the apparent possession of health and strength. In this respect modern spiritualists do not fully agree with Swedenborg, who, if we remember rightly, says that waking to consciousness after death is a gradual process—a drawing out of the real man from his earthy form, which is accomplished by the mediation of angels. The discrepancy is accounted for by the assertion that Swedenborg, by suffering his mind to dwell on the particulars of this process, came to think, that as it included so many *momenta*, it must necessarily occupy an appreciable period of time. On this point all spiritualists are agreed, and insist that they have constant revelations in confirmation of their theory. Thus, for instance, Gerald Massey, an English poet of some distinction, asserted in a lecture delivered in Chicago, in 1874, that his wife appeared to him frequently after her death, in accordance with a previous agreement; and that on one occasion he received a communication from her through the celebrated medium Home,

in which she said, "'O Gerald, when I turned on my left side, and had got through, I could not believe it. I kept on talking and thought you had suddenly gone deaf, as I could not hear you answer me.' This was exactly," said he, "what had occurred to me on this side of death. I had kept on talking, and she did not hear." "I have no doubt," he continued, "but that this truly represents the continuity of consciousness in death. Death has no power over the spirit; it simply changes the conditions of existence, not existence itself, and its powers are neither increased nor diminished, but they are exercised in greater perfection, with greater freedom, and in a wider field."

Extracts of this kind might easily be multiplied; but we must hasten to say a few words as to the Spiritualistic idea of that state into which man is admitted by death.

The question as to the locality of the world to come is one that has been very extensively discussed, and has given rise to a multitude of more or less plausible hypotheses. Dr. Harbaugh, it will be remembered, in his work on "*The Future Life*," considers and refutes a great number of these, and finally settles down to the opinion, that heaven is probably situated in some distant star or planet.

On this subject Spiritualism speaks very confidently. "The spirit world," says Crowell, "exists within the space through which our vision ordinarily ranges. It is a substantial world, though not in the ordinary sense a material one, and is much nearer to us than most people suppose. In fact its lowest sphere is in close proximity to our earth." . . . "Spirits reveal to us," he continues, "not only the existence of a spirit-world, but tell us it is divided into spheres. All agree that there are at least seven of them, and my spirit friends are unanimous in the declaration that there are many more; but confining our attention to the first seven, these are placed one above the other, at unequal distances, together forming a series of belts or zones encircling the earth, much as the rings of Saturn encircle that planet, and each adapted to the state of the spirits that inhabit it."

"The most intelligent spirits, even when communicating through the best mediums, differ in their estimates of the distance between those spheres. There is a very general agreement in their statements, that the second sphere encircles the earth at a distance of above sixty miles from the surface . . . and that the seventh sphere is distant less than one thousand miles from the earth."

"The six spheres above the first," to use the words of Prof. Hare, "are concentric zones or circles of exceedingly refined matter. They have atmospheres of peculiar vital air, soft and balmy. Their surfaces are diversified with an immense variety of picturesque landscapes, with lofty mountain ranges, valleys, rivers, lakes, forests, trees and shrubbery, and flowers of every color and variety, sending forth grateful emanations."

The lowest or earth sphere, it is asserted, is the one which falls within our atmosphere. It is occupied by millions of earth-bound spirits, and is frequently visited by those who ordinarily dwell in higher spheres. Many of the spirits of the first sphere are supremely miserable. With no aspirations beyond this world, they long for the gratifications of the flesh, while memory remains to torture them. There are however beneficent arrangements whereby in the course of time their souls become purer and happier, and then they rise, by virtue of a law as immutable as the law of gravity, but acting in an inverse direction, to the place in the spiritual system to which they are suited.

We cannot enter further upon the consideration of the conditions of spiritual existence, as indicated by spiritualists. Though spirits possess faculties and means of communication, of which it is impossible that we should form any conception, it is generally agreed, that the spirit world differs principally from ours in its greater extent, and in its higher capacities for human development. We even see it stated in the papers that Andrew Jackson Davis is preparing extensive maps of the "Summerland;" and, however ridiculous this statement may

appear, it is certainly remarkable that, though spiritualists dispute about minor particulars, as geographers might be supposed to do concerning the configuration of a newly discovered continent, there appears to be no difference of opinion among them as to the general accuracy of these representations.

The whole subject is sufficiently curious, but our limits forbid us to consider it at greater length. We cannot, however, resist the temptation of making one or two concluding remarks on the general subject of Spiritualism, which will be found to apply with special force to its eschatology.

Its whole conception of the spirit-world is of the earth, earthy. Not only is its bald materialism utterly repugnant to the soul accustomed to dwell on genuine spiritual verities, but its views of the world to come appear to be taken from a purely earthly point of observation. The idea that the spiritual world consists of a series of concentric circles, surrounding the earth, for instance, reminds us irresistibly of the Ptolemaic system of astronomy. It is such a system as might be expected to emanate from a mind that regards the earth as the centre of the universe; for though spiritualists speak of spiritual regions lying far beyond the spheres with which we are familiar, we are led to suppose that all of them have the earth for their centre. All this, it will be conceded, is more likely to be characteristic of a merely human notion than of a supernatural revelation.

Spiritualism, as a whole, is certainly not Christian, though it may, and often does, assume to be the highest development of our holy religion. If the spirits be tried by the law laid down by St. John, it will be found that they do not from the heart, confess that Jesus Christ has come into the flesh. They may make the confession in words—they generally declare that Jesus is the head of the spiritual kingdom—but of the great fact of the incarnation they appear to be profoundly ignorant. This in itself would be enough to condemn the present manifestations of spiritualism.

There appears to be much in this system which savors of the necromancy which is so strongly condemned in the Old Testament. We are aware that spiritualists have a way of explaining away these scriptural prohibitions, and that they are always ready to charge those who offer this objection to their incantations with committing the sin of the Pharisees, who ascribed Christ's miracles to Beelzebub; but we cannot resist the impression that spiritualism bears a much stronger resemblance to old-time necromancy than to a supernatural revelation. This however is a subject on which we cannot enlarge.

We can only hope that in the midst of the superstition and delusion which now justly renders spiritualism a by-word and reproach, there *may yet* be found some truths which will inure to the temporal and spiritual advantage of mankind; and that in due time mysteries will be made plain, which now appear to be beyond the reach of the human understanding.

ART. VI.—THE VOCATION AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF
THE AMERICAN COLLEGE.

THE American College in the early history of this country was modeled after the English College. This was the case with those first established, of which there were eleven before the American Revolution. They were arranged with a four years' course, having four classes, Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, and Senior. The Colleges that have been established in various sections of the country since have, for the most part, followed this model. These early Colleges were established in the interest of higher education and culture, for the purpose mainly of preparing young men for the study of one or other of the learned professions. As a general rule the Colleges of this country, both in earlier and later times, have been established and supported by the Church and private munificence. State Colleges and Universities are of a later date, and are very few in number compared with the class already referred to. An investigation will show that although these Colleges, especially in earlier times, and to some extent in later times, received aid from the State, yet they cannot be regarded as State institutions any more than a State institution becomes a private one by receiving private donations.

These Colleges are distinguished, on the one hand, from the high-school or academy, which is designed to provide an education preparatory to College or to the ordinary industrial and business pursuits of life, and from the University, on the other hand, as this exists on the Continent of Europe, which provides for a post-graduate course of study in some professional calling. Some Colleges in this

country, it is true, have attached to themselves the University feature in the establishment of departments of law, medicine, theology, etc., but generally these professional studies are pursued in institutions or under supervision specially and solely provided for this purpose. They are not a product or outgrowth of schools of a lower order, either in idea or fact, for the earliest Colleges in this country were established either before or simultaneously with such schools, and they have from the beginning given direction and guidance in one way or another to the common education provided for the people.

If we inquire as to the difference between a College and a high-school or academy, we might say that whereas the latter provides only a preliminary and partial course, the former provides a more extended and complete course of education. The main branches of such complete education have been substantially settled and fixed for centuries, embracing Philosophy, Languages, Mathematics, and Science. Each of these has its branches again, giving us the whole curriculum of the College, which it is not our purpose now to treat in detail.

When we say that this curriculum of the College embraces a *complete* education, we use the word of course in a relative sense. As human knowledge is progressive, there is a sense in which education is never complete. But a liberal education ever seeks and must find a relative conclusion and end, where it may be said to be complete for the purposes it has in view. It embraces in the main branches already named the best settled results, in a preliminary or rudimentary way, of the world's scholarship, so far as these can be comprehended in a four years' course of study. After the preparation in the primary school and the academy, this is the period of time generally agreed upon as sufficient to prepare young men for professional study or such pursuits in life as require liberal literary culture. The course opens up in one way or another the whole field of human knowledge. To the departments of

philosophy, languages, mathematics, history, literature and science, can be traced the numerous lines of human knowledge of every kind. Their mastery in the College prepares the student with the discipline and the appliances or preparation for pursuing his investigations in every direction. Viewed from the advanced position of culture, of literature and science, occupied by the world's ripe scholarship, it may indeed be said to furnish but the rudiments, the beginnings of mature education, and in this view the end of a College course on graduation day is therefore properly called *the commencement*. But viewed from the standpoint of the common-school and the academy, it differs from them, in embracing the whole circle of human knowledge and in carrying forward to completion the education there begun.

But this distinction would be somewhat unsatisfactory. It would indicate only a more advanced academic course of study and furnish nothing definite to mark its completion. This would give us rather the idea of a German Gymnasium than an American College. It would carry with it, indeed, the more complete drill and culture of mind which is sometimes held to be the main, if not the sole, object of a College course. That such extended drill and culture is of great importance no one can doubt. But it is a one-sided view to regard this alone. This must appear when we consider that truth, which is the subject-matter of all study and knowledge, is possessed of substantial objective contents, and is to be sought for ultimately for its own sake, and not merely for the purpose of the drill and culture of the mind. Otherwise a College course would be turned into a mere system of mental gymnastics, truth would be turned into a mere means of discipline, and the faculties and capacities of the individual human mind would be elevated above universal mind or reason in the form of truth, which, in the end, would be to deify man.

While discipline of mind is a highly important feature in College training, and certain forms of study seem to have this

only in view, so that the particular subject matter may be forgotten afterwards without any serious loss, yet it is felt that knowledge must have objective and permanent value also. There is a difference we know in different kinds of knowledge. Some forms are purely notional, take no hold of man's essential being, and may be received, retained, or lost without affecting the life. Other forms have to do with being, and challenge assent and acceptance on the part of the student as regards moral purpose and will. The one form is preparatory to the other. The full meaning of a branch of study is not to be found in itself, but in its relation to others and to the whole. The training of the College course comes to its completion, we may say, in *philosophy*, which is the science of general principles, in the light of which all sciences find their proper meaning.

Scientific knowledge, as such, has to do with the phenomenal and notional. In itself it can have no essential value or moral bearing. It does indeed rest back upon that which is essential, for the phenomenal creation, with its wonders and mysteries and laws, is the projection in forms of time and space, the shadowing forth, of a real spiritual universe that is unchanging and eternal—a universe of essential being. All science should stand in the element of faith in such a spiritual world, but its province as science is not directly concerned with this. It reaches this self-consciousness, as we may call it, in philosophy, which sheds light upon other forms of knowledge and gives to them direction and meaning. Mere scientific knowledge coming from the earthly side of man's being, in itself separately considered, has, therefore, no essential contents, no moral direction, and no real spiritual value. It has an office in the disciplining of man's intellectual powers, and it is a power in relation to earthly existence. It opens up the forms and mysteries of the phenomenal universe, and one side also of man's existence. It teaches the laws of human thought and human speech. It lays bare the strata of the earth and measures the distances and weight of the heavenly bodies. It fathoms

nature's laws in their uses and appliances for man's temporal welfare. But if we stop here it is not difficult to see that this knowledge is neutral in its moral bearing, and may, therefore, become a power for evil instead of good. Hence the question is now being raised whether education in this purely scientific form is a real benefit, a real good or not, and whether the State is accomplishing a really profitable service by carrying it forward in higher stages in her high schools and normal schools. Statistics are quoted to show that such purely mental scientific education has no power to restrain men from evil. We refer to this, not as an argument against science or scientific knowledge, but only to show that education cannot stop in these forms of merely scientific knowledge, but must go on to some relative completion in a self-consciousness as to the meaning, the ends and purposes of all true education. This we find in philosophy—in the true and proper sense of the word, the love of wisdom in distinction from mere notional knowledge. Philosophy has to do with truth as absolute in distinction from truth as relative and finite in merely scientific study. It confronts us with the region of absolute, eternal, ideas, fundamental among which are the ideas of the *Good, the Beautiful, the True*. We have to do here with eternal, unchanging, objective *being*, in distinction from mere thinking and knowing. The absolute truth, which is one and unchanging, passes over into the finite for the mind in the form of relative ideas, which are the subject of philosophic study in its different departments of metaphysics proper, æsthetics and ethics.

In this department of study the student is confronted with the spiritual side of his existence, the spiritual world from which his true and higher life proceeds; for man's life is twofold, on the one side earthly and sensuous; on the other spiritual and divine; and the proper end of the former is to be reached only in the latter. A proper doctrine of metaphysics must show and grant that truth in its spiritual substantiality is one and absolute, and that science is only the form in which it

reveals itself from the earthly side of man's existence. In æsthetics the beautiful is an absolute idea proceeding from the sphere of absolute being and revealing itself in finite forms in the constitution of man and of the world, and reaching a kind of second creation in the sphere of art through human genius, which is Godlike in that it can project a creation of its own. And highest of all in ethics, the doctrine of the good, we have to do with the absolute in the form of will, the doctrine of virtue, duty, of right, and social cointegration, as these constitute the whole moral order of human society in its broadest sense, and of man's ethical perfection.

It is easy to see that philosophy in this sense of it has to do with positive being and not merely notional knowledge. It has to do with life and living, and the student feels himself confronted at every step with a challenge as to his acceptance of the presence of these absolute ideas looking to the perfection of his being. The intellectual and the moral are here made to flow together in a way that they do not in mere scientific enlightenment. Scientific discipline is necessary in order to a proper study of philosophy, and is of great value, but it is only when the student comes to the study of final ends and ultimate causes that he feels his moral nature thus challenged. This is the only kind of philosophy worthy of the name—the love of wisdom. It is the philosophy which was struggled for by the divine Plato, but which he was unable fully to reach without the light of revelation. There is another sort which came in, in part, perhaps we may say, through Aristotle, and revived during the middle ages, which leaves the substance to grasp the form merely, a system of mere dialectics, with its endless logical distinctions and subtleties, which in the end leaves man famished so far as all true and essential knowledge is concerned. It became an endless treadmill in which man ever returned to the same beginning, never making a step of real progress. It had no power for man except to sharpen his wits, and it was no wonder, therefore, that the world grew weary of

it, abhorred it, and at the Reformation cast it to the winds, in order to try a new and better career of human study and investigation. Nor is it to be wondered at that in casting away the useless formalism of dialectics they threw away for a time also the true idea of philosophy, and instituted a *novum organon*, which by its doctrine of pure induction and its acceptance of only secondary causes, erred equally on the other side. The sad results we have seen in the sensationalism of Locke, the deism of England, the infidelity of France, and the rationalism of Germany. But philosophy, in its true sense, did not perish, and therefore resting in a firm faith in Christianity it is able still to assert its high prerogative as the love of wisdom and the immediate guide for scientific knowledge and education.

In this character it clearly constitutes the relative end of the college course, and as such it rules and determines the beginning, superstructure and completion of a course of liberal education. It is the light which illumines the whole pathway of instruction. It confronts us with the fontal source and end of all knowledge, which is the sphere of the Absolute, and this is only another name for God.

It might seem that in assigning this high prerogative to philosophy as a directing and ruling power in education, we are unmindful that this belongs only to Christianity. But such is not our meaning. We freely grant that philosophy is not a light in and of itself. It must be illumined by the light of Christianity and be made to rest in Christian faith. This we have hinted at already, and we shall consider this point further on in our remarks. What we mean is that relatively speaking philosophy occupies this high position.

We have now reached in a very brief statement what we mean by saying that it belongs to the character of a college education, that it should reach its completion in a sound system of philosophic teaching, without which its different branches of study reach no union, but like scattered streams waste themselves in the desert sand. A college without a system of phil-

osophy is like a vessel on the bosom of the sea without compass or helm. It may spread its sails to the wind and move with great velocity, it may display great power (for knowledge is power), but it will have no given direction. It will be at the mercy of the winds and waves, and will be liable at any time to drift into quicksands or be dashed against the rocks. A college does not discharge its responsibility that has not a system of reigning thought in the form of philosophy. This responsibility cannot be evaded. Some philosophy in the form of general principles will in one way or another control and direct the spirit of the institution. This is according to the constitution of the human mind and the order of human life. The general always and in all spheres rules the particular. Human life and pursuits are always under the direction and sway of general principles which determine their character, though for the most part men are not fully conscious of them. All men, indeed, are guided by a philosophy, though generally it is not their own, but accepted from others. In the same way a college will necessarily be under the guidance of a philosophy, whether systematic or not, but it may be in the way of a mere blind following. In all such cases it fails to meet its proper responsibility either through incapacity or indifference.

Colleges have a grave responsibility here, not only for themselves, in the way of a proper self-understanding, a self-consciousness which directs their own work, but also in other spheres of life, and this in different ways. The majority of the leading minds that control the affairs of Church and State, receive a college education. They will to some extent at least carry with them in after life the principles instilled into their minds during their college course. Subsequent professional study and the rugged practical experience of life will to some extent modify these, but they will return to assert their power. These principles are universal. They relate to man as man, as an individual and as society. They assert a doctrine of virtue and duty for all men in every sphere and relation in life.

They point out the divinely ordained order of the family and the State,—of the whole social economy. Their influence here will assert itself in one direction or another. If these principles are unsound, who can measure the influence for evil they will exert through educated minds and men of power? Errors and defects in mere scientific attainments may have but small effect. But let a man's views of the moral nature of man, of virtue and duty, and of the moral order of society, the family, the State, be false, and who cannot see that it will work as a moral leaven for evil so far as his influence extends. And if on the other hand they are sound, a corresponding influence for good will be exerted.

Then we may refer here also to the influence of colleges on education in the various schools of a lower grade. True there seems to be a separation here between the higher and lower education of our country. The common schools are entirely under State control and the colleges under different control. But such is the law of life that in one way or another influences will descend from the higher to the lower. Through scientific investigations, through the dissemination of views, through text books and teachers, the influence of the colleges will reach out and exert a more or less moulding influence on education at large, and most powerfully in the way of general principles. Just at this time especially the problem of State education is struggling to find its own true end. What shall be its limit? What are the fundamental principles that should direct and animate it? These questions can be answered only from the standpoint of sound principles as to the true nature and end of all right education, and here the colleges will serve as guides and direction to a greater or less extent, directly or indirectly.

In these remarks upon the importance of philosophy in a college course we can, of course, mean no undervaluation of the different branches besides that are pursued. These enter as necessary integral elements of a liberal education, and the college is responsible that they shall be

thoroughly taught. The course of study laid down in the ordinary college curriculum is not arbitrary, but its selection is the result of centuries of experience as to what study is best adapted for the discipline and culture of the mind. None of these can be omitted without serious loss. Therefore it pertains to the responsibilities of every institution bearing the name of a college to provide for sufficient, accurate and thorough instruction in all the branches and departments thus laid down, while at the same time it brings them to a conclusion in its general system of thought.

II. Having now considered what constitutes a complete education in a college distinguished from an academic education, we proceed in the second place to define and determine its calling as distinguished from a University, and all such institutions as have for their direct object some practical pursuit in life.

It is true that all proper education looks to such practical end, and serves as a preparation for it, but not just in the same way. The University or the Technic school has such end for their immediate and direct object. The University, for instance, provides a post-graduate course. The teaching and lectures are occupied with professional studies, or with certain departments of learning intended for those who for some purpose wish to make them a specialty. Theology, Philosophy, Law, and Medicine, have special faculties or lecturers, while scholarly instruction is imparted in the more advanced departments of the different sciences. Universities of this kind have a specific character different entirely from the American College. They are intended for a different object and a different class of students. The Gymnasia of Germany correspond more nearly in their nature and object to the American College, while yet they are somewhat different.

Then there is a department of education which has come into prominence of late years, called scientific and technic, which provides specially for the study of such branches of science, as refer more directly to the practical pursuits of life.

In some cases these studies are provided for in special institutions devoted solely to them, while in others they are conjoined with the old regular course in a college. The tendency has been growing of late years in this country to introduce such scientific courses, as they are called, into the curriculum of the regular college so as to produce institutions of a mixed character. Students then at their own option are allowed to pursue either the regular classic course, or a mixed course, combining the classic and the scientific, or merely the scientific course. Such provision has no doubt been made, in order to satisfy the practical tendency of life in America, and the strong desire to utilize education directly in relation to the pursuits of life. Such sciences as Chemistry, Mineralogy, Metallurgy, Geology, Mining and Engineering, have a direct bearing on practical pursuits, and can be directly utilized in opening up the wealth and promoting the industry of the country.

Such education, as in the case of that of the University, unquestionably has its place and calling, and for those institutions that may be prepared to make the trial it may be proper to join it with the regular college course. But in that case the result is, not a college pure and simple in the old established sense, but a mixed institution. We do not propose to discuss the merits of such education any more than that of the University. We only refer to them in order to distinguish and describe more clearly the character of a college education in its nature, meaning and object.

In distinction from such institutions it is the object of the college to provide an education that shall have for its primary object liberal and humane culture for its own sake, or we may state it as the liberal culture of man as man, for his own sake primarily, and then for the practical uses to which it may be applied. As under the first point we considered the nature of a complete education objectively considered, we now have to consider the subject of such education, which is man, in the full and free development of all his powers. Man is an end in

himself, and not merely an instrument for some end beyond, himself. He is the end of the whole natural creation, the crown of all God's works. The world is indeed his dwelling-place. He was made to rule over it, and utilize it for his own proper purposes and wants. As in his fall, he was doomed to cultivate the ground and eat his bread in the sweat of his face, it has become a necessity to study the laws of nature, and put forth effort in order to use the world for his temporal support and comfort. In this view he becomes, so to speak, a part of the natural world, and must find in it the means of his physical and industrial advancement. Yet there is room here to consider the education of man as man, looking primarily to what he is, and what he is to become by the proper discipline and culture of his high powers.

An education looking to this end, man's development and completion as man, must be liberal, that is, free. The freedom of man consists in living and moving intelligently and willingly in harmony with truth and law. As applied to the intellectual powers, it consists in their development by the presence and power of truth. Man is in no respect self-subsistent. His true life comes from beyond himself. The body is dependent upon outward conditions for its growth and preservation. By a divine power working through nature, he receives his constant ability to live and move from the air he breathes and the food he eats. The mind is related in a somewhat corresponding way to a world or sphere of being in union with which it exists and expands. This is the world of truth which is the form in which life reaches the intellect. The human mind is a form of spiritual existence, a capacity, but its essential life comes from beyond itself. The mind is made for truth. Truth can enter it only by the activity of the mind in appropriating it. The mind at first is narrow, unfree. It takes partial and imperfect views of things, and is under the tyranny of mere opinions. Truth on the other hand is the very breath of mental freedom, it is broad, universal, free. As the mind

enters the sphere of truth, in the legitimate exercise of its powers, it begins to experience the same breadth, catholicity and freedom. It is, indeed, not the less bound, but its bondage now is free in harmony with universal and necessary laws. Its thinking is not partial, private opinion, but according to the laws of truth. In short, that intellect is free which is bound by the truth, and only by the truth.

His æsthetic nature is challenged by the beautiful. As he receives the beautiful into his being through the phantasy, the artistic element in his nature is awakened and developed in the cultivation of grace and refinement. The earth is not only useful, but it is also beautiful. A temple is not only constructed for the accommodation of its worshipers, but as it rises in beautiful structure, bold proportions, and appropriate decorations, it mirrors forth the idea which it represents. So man, the crown of the world and the temple for nature, should reveal in himself the reflection and reproduction of the idea of the beautiful.

His ethical nature is made for the good. This is the highest element of his nature, and the one in and through which alone all the others can come to their proper completion. In its rudimentary forms the will is unfree. It exists in the form of mere blind appetency, of inclination, desire, passion. To become free it must receive into itself the substance of the good. It must become unselfed in order to find its true self-hood. The will is then only free when it becomes a willing organ of moral law, and is inspired by love. Then it is released from bondage to mere impulse and passion, to mere caprice and selfish purpose.

Such humane culture may be obtained to a certain extent and incidentally, it is true, in the cultivation and study of some practical branch of education, but in such case this culture is partial, one-sided, and defective. Only where it is set forth as the primary object in view, can it be reached in the full sense. Such general culture is of a higher order than any

merely partial culture, and it gives to this latter its true dignity. It is truly an ornament to man in all conditions in life. The lawyer or the physician is admired and esteemed for his professional knowledge and skill, but it is expected that his training shall not be entirely limited to this. In the important position he occupies in society, it is expected that his culture shall also be general as in his character. If with all his imperfections and failings, we can say with BURNS, "a man's a man for a' that," so with the best special and professional skill, we may say a cultivated man is a man in addition to all that.

A liberal education is indeed practical in the highest and best sense, for a man who is thoroughly disciplined and cultured is the least prepared to turn his attention with effect to the practical pursuits of life, whereas one who lacks such preliminary culture will be less competent to master the study of such practical calling. So also the man who is liberally educated will be able not only to fill his particular calling, but above and beyond that, he will be able to act his part in general society and for general interests. For lack of this full and general culture the various professions have been losing that commanding position, dignity and influence, which they formerly possessed. The tendency has been to crowd into them without sufficient preliminary training, so that the complaint is that the professions are overcrowded, and the standard of culture is lowered. We do not mean by this that true culture may not be found outside of a college. Some of the best cultivated men in public and professional life in our country, have not been graduates of a college, but as a rule this culture is acquired by the time and study prescribed in a college course.

To this end the curriculum of the college is arranged on a system which has received the sanction of ages of trial. It has remained substantially the same in our American colleges. It embraces a four years' course of discipline in the study of language, mathematics, natural science, history, literature and

philosophy, each pursued in a free way for its own sake, without immediate and direct reference to the practical uses to which it may be applied. The principle here involved is susceptible of easy illustration. The human body is formed for practical uses aside from or along with its being the outward organ for the spirit of man, which is its highest purpose. Primarily its development and discipline should have reference to its relation to the spirit. But in regard to its uses for ends and purposes of a worldly nature outside of man, the best preparation for a particular service primarily is the full and equal development of all its powers. Suppose a man needs a strong arm to wield the heavy hammer, shall he in the period of youth begin to strengthen that member specially, before his body as a whole has attained its full development? Clearly not; for the strength and power of each part depends on the healthy condition of the whole. Let the whole body receive a symmetrical development, and then there will be time and room for the special discipline of any part to adapt it to special uses and pursuits. The same is true of the mind. A well disciplined mind is prepared at the proper time to apply itself to special, intellectual or scientific pursuits, besides being prepared to occupy a proper position in relation to the general affairs of society; whereas the mind that has been early disciplined with reference to one pursuit, is in danger of becoming weakened and dwarfed in relation to others.

The proper subject of education primarily is man, as man, with reference to the completion of his manhood, and after that, special education for particular callings and pursuits of life. All, indeed, cannot attain this with the present condition of society, for all cannot secure a liberal education. But it is just here that the responsibility of a college in the old sense finds its limits. There are other institutions in which those who do not aim at a liberal education may be educated, and they are necessary and proper in their place; but for those of the other class referred to the college is certainly limited to one particular work.

"A liberal education, in its very nature, regards not primarily any ends of business or professional work. It is not without reference to these, indeed, as an ulterior object, since all true human culture must show itself to be at last practical in some way; but what it aims at immediately, and for the time being exclusively, is the cultivation of the mind for its own sake. All may easily see that this is something very different from forming the mind to be a fit instrument simply for securing other interests which lie outside of itself, and are not therefore at once of its own constitution. Training for such outward utilitarian purposes (whether in lower or higher forms) involves, of course mental culture—a discipline, as far as it goes, of the student's capacities and powers. But it is not, as such, liberal or *free* training; because the mind is held bound in it always as means to an outward end. Only where education has its end in itself can it be truly of this high character. That is just what the term *liberal* properly here means."*

The utilitarian theory is unsound and unsafe as a principle generally, and it is dangerous when applied to education as a ruling factor. It can set no limits in defining what is useful in the ultimate sense, because for that purpose man must be viewed in relation to his final end and destiny, and what that is no mere human wisdom can determine. It is a true principle in its place, but it is not a fundamental or primary principle. It cannot understand and define itself, but must look beyond itself for this light. If you ask what the useful is, no satisfactory answer can be given from the principle itself. What is good and true is always useful in the end, but we cannot say that what is useful in the ordinary sense of the word is always good and true. Its application in education often, and always ultimately, runs into absurdity. Education is thus sought to be made practical before it has fairly begun to be theoretical. Even into the primary and rudimentary forms of education it is often introduced, only to bring confusion. The

* Dr. Nevin in Catalogue of Franklin and Marshall College.

cui bono is applied at every step and its proper answer can never be given without reference to another principle. A given study may discipline and improve the mind—that certainly is useful, but not, it may be, directly for any practical end beyond the mind itself. To commence with this principle is reversing the true order. The inquiry should first be, what is true and good, and its utility will follow.

Thus far we have aimed at elucidating two points—1st, that the education provided by a college reaches a relative completion in a *curriculum* of studies which forms the introduction to the whole field of learning, and reaches its meaning in a system of philosophy; and 2d, that this education is designed primarily for the full and free culture of the student. But in reference to both these points we may now say that they would be entirely unsatisfactory and fall into confusion, without the introduction of a still higher guiding principle in education. Philosophy furnishes principles that serve as a directory and guide for the education which it completes and crowns; but what is the light and guide for philosophy? We know as a fact that it does not contain in itself the power of self-direction in the truth. It is not infallible. On the contrary it has often gone astray. Philosophy may be true or false, good or bad, according as it receives or does not receive the true light that comes from a higher source. There have been as many systems of philosophy as of religion. They arise through great minds and the spirit of an age, flourish for a time, and then pass away and give place to others.

It is only in Christianity as a divine revelation that philosophy and science in general can find a sure and steady guide to the truth, or rather perhaps we should say in the author of Christianity, who is Himself the light of the world, the light that lighteth every man coming into the world. He says of Himself, "I am the light of the world; He that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life." These words of the founder of Christianity stand out alone, as

compared with the words of the wise men of the world, in their high assumption, and in the sublimity of their utterance. They assume that He alone who utters them is able to direct all human thinking into the truth. He is the light of all true philosophy.

So also while in education man may be postulated as relatively an end in himself, yet in the absolute sense his end is God. While we may speak of a culture having man for its end, culture for its own sake, yet it is true also that man is to be educated for the divine and heavenly, where only his true destiny is to be reached. Whereas, therefore, it would be degrading to educate man merely for an earthly end beyond himself, seeing that he is himself the end of the world, which was made for him, and not he for it, yet to refuse to recognize the end of man in God would be to reject all faith in the Creator of the Universe and deify man, which would be accursed idolatry.

These two points need to be somewhat amplified in order to reach our conclusion as to the relation of Christianity to education and the position of a college in regard to this subject.

Human knowledge in the highest and best form man is able to attain by the mere light of nature is not a sufficient guide without the aid of revelation. It may be said that truth in every form illumines its own pathway, and therefore if man will follow the light of science step by step, with a love of the truth, he will be safely guided; that while revelation is necessary to enlighten man in regard to religious questions, yet for its own ends and purposes the human intellect can direct its way in the sphere of merely natural truth, so that science and philosophy may be successfully pursued apart from any supernatural light and help. But truth is one and universal although it may come to us in different ways. The law that the higher sphere of knowledge and being illumines and determines the lower is as fixed and necessary as the order of the universe.

Man illumines nature, matter comes to its meaning in mind. Nature could not interpret itself. In itself it could have no

meaning. It was only when the human spirit was created that a spiritual light dawned upon the world and revealed its mystery and meaning, just as the natural sun reveals its outlines to the natural eye. As the end of creation man was the type that moulded and modeled all the processes of nature below him. The end was in the beginning as well as in the result and the efficient causes. We do not reach man from nature according to the Darwin hypothesis, but we reach nature in its apprehension and interpretation from man. There is, it is true, an upward nixus everywhere apparent in nature, and this is the truth in Darwinism, and a great truth it is, too much and too long overlooked. Every step and process in the order of nature, from the lowest to the highest, adumbrates and foreshadows man, illustrating the mysterious words that man, in one view, is formed and fashioned in the dark places of the earth, and this is the meaning of the equally mysterious word, that God made man out of the dust of the earth. But the archetype and the light which moulds and illumines the processes of this grand result come from above, the inbreathing of the Spirit, according to the words, God breathed into his nostrils and man became a living soul.

Hence we say that the only light that can reveal the meaning of nature is man. If this be true, then we are forced to the conclusion that the only light that illumines man and reveals his nature and destiny is God. The idea of man is the light of all science of nature. The idea of God is the light of man, of humanity. Much indeed has been gained for the cause of truth by the manner in which Darwin and his school have pointed out the types and resemblances of man in nature below him. But the crystal or the plant, or the mute animal cannot see or know this. It is only man in the light of the idea of man that can understand it. Equally true, is it, then, that humanity reaches its meaning only in the light of the idea of God. *Deus nos personat*. Nature, it is true, reveals God, but only in the light of the idea of God. That idea in man pre-

cedes the light and voice of nature, and that idea comes not from nature, or from man, but from God. It is God-given, revealed from above. If man could derive the idea of God from nature, nature would be God; and if he could originate it from himself, then man would be God. Hence we are driven to the alternative that either pantheism is true, or the knowledge of God comes by revelation from God to man.

The conclusion we reach here is, that human science and philosophy must receive its light and direction from above. The world's history and experience abundantly prove this. Ancient heathen philosophy sought by its own light to solve the destiny of man, but it failed. Religious error became the source of error in other spheres of knowledge. The greatest and the best of ancient sages acknowledged that man could not attain to a knowledge of the truth unless some one came down from above to teach him.

"I dare say that you, Socrates, feel as I do how very hard or almost impossible is the attainment with any certainty about questions such as these in the present life. And yet I should deem him a coward who did not prove what is said about them to the uttermost, or whose heart failed him before he had examined them on every side. For he should persevere until he has attained one of two things: either he should discover or be taught the truth about them; or, if this is impossible, I would have him take the least and most irrefragable of human theories, and let this be the raft upon which he sails through life—not without risk, as I admit, *if he cannot find some word of God* which will most surely and safely carry him."—Phædo, i. 414.

We have now also covered our second point. As science and philosophy, education in itself considered, needs for its completion the knowledge of God, so also man, the subject of education, is not an absolute end in himself, but must find this end in the one Absolute Being who is the end of all things. And

this, not only in the way of knowledge, but also in the form of will. Man cannot reach his ethical completion in his own strength. He cannot actualize in himself what he knows. Knowing the right he pursues the wrong.

I do not propose to enter upon an argument to show that, a revelation being postulated, the only absolute revelation is that given to the world in the Sent of God—the Lord Jesus Christ; and that therefore the Christian religion is the only absolute religion. Before this audience I assume this. The point now to be considered is as to the vocation and responsibility of colleges in regard to Christianity.

Their history throws much light on what has been all along designed on this subject in their founding. All the early American colleges were founded, not by the State (although some of them, perhaps all, received State aid at one time or another) but by church influence and private beneficence. Provision was made in them for imparting religious instruction. This in the earlier times, was strictly enforced. It was not for a moment thought that education and religion might be separated. They were united according to the traditions brought over from the old world. It has continued a marked feature of colleges in this country that they have always maintained this union of education and religion. The idea of conducting education without positive religious teachings came in at a late date in the education of the country. As our government favors no particular religion while it equally protects all, it was felt that the public schools should be free from any religious bias. We do not propose to consider this point so far as the State schools are concerned. We merely note as a fact that the system of higher education, as carried forward in our colleges, differs in this respect from that of the State schools. And just here it is, we think, that the highest responsibility devolves upon them. It belongs to their vocation to maintain the union of Christianity with education.

It is well for the education of our country that this is done

in those institutions which give direction in one way or another to all our schools. Here the last results in education are wrought out, here are the sources of influence and power. If education in these higher institutions were in any way antagonistic to Christianity or even neutral, the sad results would soon be felt in all our schools. As it is, a healthful, leavening influence has gone forth and moulded more or less the general spirit of the nation in this respect. The public schools are consciously or unconsciously moulded by it, as well as by the general Christian life of the nation. Whatever may be the necessity theoretically in regard to religious teaching in these schools, it is universally conceded that practically they ought to reflect the spirit of the people and be open to the influence of Christianity in the way at least of sound Christian morality. The spirit and customs of the people here are more potent than abstract theories. Teachers are expected to enjoin the precepts of the Christian religion as the basis of the conduct of the pupils, and in many, especially the high schools, these precepts are daily read from the word of God. On this point they will naturally adapt themselves to the wants of the people in any given district.

Precisely how this relation between Christianity and education in our colleges should best formulate and assert itself is a question not yet solved. In some colleges, under direct church care and influence, the symbols of the church are taught. In others equally positive on the general subject, the religious teaching is of a less sectarian and more catholic character. Generally the requirements are of such a character that no offence is given to the religious beliefs or conscientious scruples of any of the students. Religious teaching of a strictly denominational character, if provided for, is limited to those who may wish to avail themselves of it. Such teaching, it is generally conceded, may be referred to the appliances of the church.

But the chief point here, as we think, turns upon whether the teaching and life of the college as a whole is under Chris-

tian influence, and especially whether the sciences and philosophy taught are permeated by Christian principles. There may be a great deal of direct religious teaching, in a somewhat external way, where there is at the same time a divorce internally between this and the reigning thought that prevails in the institution. An un-Christian view of science or system of the philosophy may prevail alongside of strict Christian teaching. In this way skepticism and infidelity often come in to steal away the good results, while direct formal Christian teaching still continues to be employed.

In saying this we do not mean to detract from the importance of positive Christian teaching in our colleges. We rather urge it as highly necessary. Not only in precept, but in all its appliances Christianity should be domiciled as the inspiring genius of a college. It should be there in the way of living organization. The college should live and move in the bosom of the Christian Church. This has often been overlooked. Christianity is not mere letter and precept, but it is life. It is not an abstraction but an organized power with a body as well as a soul.

But in addition to this it pertains to the vocation of a college to do something in the way of bringing Christianity and science, or education, into internal organic union in an objective way. It is not sufficient that they shall merely stand side by side, each maintaining its own independent rights. Neither can science and philosophy now yield themselves in such a merely external way to the subserviency of religion, as in the Middle Ages. The emancipation of thought that took place at the Reformation must find a different solution of the problem. There must be freedom. Philosophy and science must freely receive the light of revelation, and seek for an inward harmony between them. Thus, philosophy and science, still holding their own sphere, become Christian in the true sense. The light of reason yields to the guidance of revelation without surrendering its own independent prerogative. As Church and

State seek thus to harmonize their relations freely, so also, religion and science find their inward union.

This problem may indeed be said to remain as yet unsolved. We may grant that the harmony between religion and science is not yet accomplished. Perhaps it will not be fully until the new creation shall have lifted up and glorified the old. But the standpoint of a Christian college is that of faith—a firm faith in the fact that the two are ultimately in harmony. This already is much. It freely admits the light of revelation in the work of learning, and studies science in the spirit of humble faith in the one Lord of the whole universe, of the spiritual and the natural.

If such be the true calling of an American college in distinction from educational institutions of other grades and types, then we may readily find the limits of its responsibilities. These are only commensurate with its calling. Its claim to existence demands that it shall do and do well the full work of a college. This work as we have seen is very specifically different from that of a mere academy. Its curriculum should honestly and faithfully embrace the complete circle of scientific and humane studies, and its instruction in these should be equally honest and faithful. Its standard of scholarship should not be lowered to win a mistaken popular favor or to crowd its halls with students. The influence and power of its work depend not on numbers, not on quantity so much as quality. Indeed it should be placed above the temptation of seeking patronage by departing from its fixed course at any point. It should provide a finished culture for its students. It should train them to be thinkers, so that in scholarship, culture and power of thought they may adorn the republic of letters into which it introduces them.

Holding fast to this character and calling there is room for progress, of course, in the work of colleges. They should keep abreast with the constant advance in science and literature, and the methods of teaching. But an institution claiming only to be a college is not responsible for not providing a kind of

education which does not belong to its calling. And here lies its chief power, in being true to its calling and fulfilling it with efficiency. Instead of aiming to diffuse its power over every sort of training, like some mammoth business houses that aim to absorb and monopolize every branch of business in one, even if it had the means, it should seek rather to reach efficiency and depth in its one distinct work. To attempt such branching out without the means, thereby weakening what it is doing in order to do more, would be unwise and insane.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

HANDBUCH DER CHRISTLICHEN KIRCHEN-GESCHICHTE FÜR PREDIGER UND GEMEINDE-GLIEDER. Vollständig in zwei Theilen von H. J. Rutenik, Th. Dr. Ev. Ref. Buch-Anstalt, 991 Scranton Ave., Cleveland, Ohio.

The history of the Christian Church is a field of inquiry so full of instruction, so rich in spiritual wealth, and yet so difficult to be thoroughly explored and intelligibly represented, that although we have numerous works on the subject, some extensive and designed chiefly for scholars, and others simple, brief and compact adapted to the wants of Christians generally; yet there is still room and occasion, especially in the Reformed Church of the United States, for another work conceived and wrought out like the one before us, from the Reformed point of observation, and holding in view particularly the needs of the Reformed population on American soil; and the Rev. Dr. Rutenik deserves the thanks of his brethren for producing a book which in many respects is well fitted to supply this demand.

Based on extensive reading and careful study of authorities, this work, written in a clear, forcible style, aims at a representation of the origin and progress of the Christian Church under both the general and particular aspects of history. We have neither a merely general survey nor only a detailed account of persons and events. We have rather both in one. The general view of the world before and at the time of Christ, and of the church in its

origin and progress, and the author's conceptions of successive epochs and periods of history, are filled out with a judicious selection of interesting events relating to persons and times. So successful has Dr. Rutenik been in combining these opposite elements that his "*Handbuch*" is to some extent both an interpretation of the good and evil forces operating in ecclesiastical history, and at the same time an illustration, by particular facts, of these general forces. Thus it becomes in reality what it purports to be: a hand-book for ministers and people. We take pleasure in adding that the result of his industry merits a place among works of reference on church history in the libraries of all our ministers.

For those who know the author it is needless to say, that these volumes are written from a positive Christian stand-point. His history moves in the element of unquestioning faith in the divine human person of our Lord, and in the divine and ultimate authority of the written Word. Fashioned by the spirit of the Protestant Reformation, and animated by the life of the Reformed faith, the author recognizes the true and good as well as exposes the false and evil forces active in the medieval no less than in the Primitive ages; and in accordance with the promise of Christ, he affirms the presence of His Holy Spirit in every period and epoch, as well as the agency of Satan and the wickedness of men. On most questions we can accept his general views as sound. Even where we must dissent he is, in our opinion, to be regarded as emphasizing elements which without doubt enter into the course of history. Where we dissent we see deficiencies, and one-sided conceptions rather than downright errors and groundless notions. The pervading tone of the work is positive, firm, hopeful, cheerful and healthy. We have discovered no morbid tendencies in any direction. Though Protestant and Reformed, this History is free from bigotry.

The limits of our notice forbid a particular review. Though we must take exception here and there; yet the "*Handbuch*" of Dr. Rutenik possesses such solid merit, and is so well adapted to its purpose, that we commend it to general attention and confidence. In a form suitable alike for the clergy and laity, it exhibits within small compass the whole field of church history.

The first volume covers the first fifteen centuries; the second is

devoted to the Reformation and to the manifold developments which have since then appeared in the domain of church life. We suggest that some one make a similar contribution to our literature in the English language; or "upset" the excellent work of Dr. Ru-
tenik.
E. V. G.

A REVIEW OF THE POLITICAL CONFLICT IN AMERICA, *from the commencement of the Anti-slavery Agitation to the close of Southern Reconstruction; comprising also a resume of the career of Thaddeus Stevens.* By ALEXANDER HARRIS. New York: T. H. Pollock, Publisher, 37 Park Row, 1876.

The author of this book, a well-known member of the Lancaster (Pa.) bar, with whom for years the interest of letters has stood higher than the interest of mere professional business, is already favorably accredited with the public by other productions of his pen, among which may be named particularly his "Biographical History of Lancaster County." Looking over the volume before us, we have no hesitation in saying that it shows a decided improvement on all his previous writings so far as they have come under our observation. The subject, of course, is of the greatest interest and importance; while the treatment of it is managed with what seems to us to have been the most faithful industry and care. The book is written with clear method, in interesting and pleasing style, and is valuable as a comprehensive summary, or synopsis of the general train of events in our American history, which came to its full significance at least through our late civil war. Such a work on such a theme in the nature of the case, must be estimated from the stand-point of the writer, with due consideration of the lights and shadows it is found to take upon itself necessarily from this as a tower of observation. Mr. Harris leaves us in no uncertainty whatever, with regard to what his own position is in this respect, as a historian of our national struggle. He made himself somewhat famous, it is known, by his steady opposition to the war from its inception to its close; and the view he takes of it now in his history, is ruled by a corresponding condemnatory judgment throughout. But he has maintained, nevertheless, we think, what must be regarded as on the whole a predominantly calm and candid tone in his record of facts and things as they appear to his own mind. A

purely *objective* portraiture of such a historical subject is hardly possible in the present generation. Some coloring of interest and passion is sure to enter into the work, however honestly intended. It is much, if only there *be* such honest intention and endeavor in the case; and to this praise (which in these days we hold to be great praise) the author of the book before us appears to be justly entitled.

N.

THE CHRISTOLOGY OF ST. JOHN. A Synodical Sermon by John B. Thompson, D.D. New York: J. J. Little & Co., Printers, 10 to 20 Astor Place.

This is a somewhat remarkable sermon to be delivered before a Reformed (Dutch) Synod, and to go out with that synod's *imprimatur*. It aims to set forth the view of the person of Christ and of Christianity that has been taught and emphasized in the Reformed (German) Church for more than a quarter of a century. Christianity is essentially life, and that life is the resurgent life of Christ in His people. "It was necessary," the sermon says, "that this divine life should be manifested in the likeness of sinful flesh before it could become ours. It must be adapted to our capability of apprehension. So also it was necessary that it should triumph over sin and death in the human nature of Christ before it could avail to accomplish this mighty result in us. *For this reason the Lord died and rose again*, that as He lives so we may live also; holily, happily, eternally. The life which He shares with His people is even now His resurrection life, &c." We must assert "the *immanence* of God, along with his *transcendence*. John was not afraid that the theology which he had learned of Jesus would lead to Pantheism. It is the cure of Pantheism, as well as for Deism."

All that, and much more, of the same kind that might be quoted, is well spoken. It is just what has been written in articles and preached in sermons for years in the German Reformed Church. But when our ministers and teachers maintained that the object of the death and resurrection of Christ was that He might live in us, it was charged as being a denial of the atonement; and when it was asserted that His resurrection life dwells in us, it was charged as being Pantheism. And yet here is a Reformed (Dutch) Synod endorsing all that as preached by one of its own ministers.

The only complaint we have to make against the sermon is that in one of the notes the author does gross injustice to the "sister church of the Heidelberg Catechism pure and simple." He there says that our Church, "like that which follows the Anglican cultus, has largely fallen off into externalism. The prevailing doctrine in both is that of the mediation of material existences, of bishops, or of sacraments, or both, between us and Christ, thus lapsing into the formalism of the ante-Reformation period. On the other hand the other Reformed churches, constrained by their system, *do not make prominent the doctrine of divine life in Christ for us.*" He seems to know us only in the liturgical movement that has agitated our churches. But before that, and deeper than that, has been the theological movement that has been distinguished just for "making prominent this doctrine of divine life in Christ for us." If any Reformed church in this country, or in Europe, has ever emphasized this doctrine, certainly ours has done so. If the author had been familiar with such writings among us as Dr. Nevin's *Mystical Presence*, he would doubtless have given us credit for this.

But we can readily overlook this error in view of the rich Christological truth which the sermon contains. If it is at all read and understood in the Dutch Church, it must certainly appear as a new gospel. And yet it is the teaching of the Heidelberg catechism, and what is more, it is certainly the Gospel according to St. John.

We would be willing to yield much that has been aimed at in our liturgical movement, if this Christological doctrine would be unanimously accepted. We believe that in the heat of discussion and party strife, too much stress on both sides has been laid upon the mere question of liturgical worship. So far as this Christological doctrine underlies the liturgy, it is indeed important and vital, but we do not believe that mere forms of worship are worth as much contention as has been bestowed upon the matter in our church. Worship may be equally acceptable with or without a formal liturgy, but the Christological faith set forth in this sermon, and for long time emphasized in what is called our Mercersburg Theology, belongs to the foundation of things in the Church.

T. G. A.

A VOCABULARY OF THE PHILOSOPHICAL SCIENCES, &c. By Charles P. Krauth, S. T. D., LL. D., Vice-Prevost of the University of Pennsylvania New York: Sheldon & Company, 1878.

We have room merely to announce the publication of this valuable work and acknowledge its reception from the esteemed editor. We shall try to find room for a fuller notice of it heretofore in connection with a new work on the History of Modern Philosophy, which has been sent to us but not yet received. For students in the department of Philosophy it is certainly a necessity. No other department of study is burdened with so large a class of technical terms, just because no other department is so extensive, and has to do with so many difficult problems. This work is not a mere dry vocabulary, but its brief definitions often throw a flood of light upon the most difficult subjects. To make it what it is has required a full mastery of the whole field of philosophic study. Besides this mastery, Dr. Krauth has, as he modestly says, "a working acquaintance with the languages which are the main repositories of philosophic thought." The literary public will highly appreciate this additional contribution by Dr. Krauth to a department of study which is rapidly coming to receive increased attention in the institutions of this country.

MODERN PHILOSOPHY, from DESCARTES to SCHOPENHAUER and HARTMAN. By FRANCIS BOWEN, A. M., Alford Professor of Natural Religion and Moral Philosophy in Harvard College. NEW YORK: SCRIBNER, ARMSTRONG and COMPANY. 1877.

A substantial volume of 484 pages, price three dollars. It is a work on Modern Philosophy, and not a history, as its title indicates. It is not intended therefore to take the place of such works as Morrell or Ueberweg. It does indeed give a history of some of the leading modern systems, with interesting biographical notices of their authors or founders; but its principal object is not merely historical. Nor is it a mere commentary on these systems. "Aiming to be thorough and impartial in setting forth the opinions of others, I have also held it to be a duty frankly to avow and earnestly to defend the whole doctrine which appeared to me to be just and true, whether it was also of good report or not." The author,

although not a clergyman, has definite convictions respecting the fundamental truths of theology. "Earnestly desiring to avoid prejudice on either side," he says, "and to welcome evidence and argument from whatever source they might come, without professional bias, and free from any external inducement to teach one set of opinions rather than another, I have faithfully studied most of what the philosophy of these modern times and the science of our own day assume to teach. And the result is, that I am now more fully convinced than ever that what has been justly called 'the dirt-philosophy' of materialism and fatalism is baseless and false. I accept with unhesitating conviction and belief the doctrine of the being of one Personal God, the Creator and Governor of the world, and of one Lord Jesus Christ, in whom 'dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily;' and I have found nothing whatever in the literature of modern infidelity which, to my mind, casts even the slightest doubt upon that belief."

This is certainly satisfactory as to the Christian stand-point of the author. Of course this in itself is not a guarantee that he is able to present a satisfactory criticism upon the great philosophic systems of modern times. Nor are we prepared without further examination of the book to say how far we could agree with his philosophic views. But from what we know of the author through a former work on Political Economy, and from the cursory examination we have made of this, we feel satisfied that it is a work of ability and will prove a help in understanding the system of thought brought forward in the work. Its notice comes down to the present time, ending with Hartmann's Philosophy and Metaphysics of the Unconscious. We will endeavor to give a fuller notice of the work in a future number of the REVIEW.

